DIGEST SERIES

Digest Series No. 4

THIRTY ONE VILLAGES OF TAMILNADU
THE 1961 CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

by

S. Guhan

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
79, SECOND MAIN ROAD, GANDHINAGAR, ADYAR
MADRAS 600 020

Digest Series No.4

THIRTY ONE VILLAGES OF TAMILNADU
THE 1961 CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

by

S. Guhan

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

79, Second Main Road, Gandhinagar,

Adyar, Madras 600 020

June 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Pages
1.	Foreword	1 - 4
2.	Introduction to the Surveys	5 - 7
3.	Typology and general characteristics of the villages	8 - 21
4.	Basic Needs	22 - 32
5.	Poverty	33 - 55
6.	Caste, Social Relations and the Panchayat	56 - 65
7.	Alphabetical index to village survey monographs	66
8.	Appendix: Annotated index to village survey monographs	67 - 74

THIRTY ONE VILLAGES OF TAMIL NADU

THE 1961 CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

Foreword*

1. The population census of 1961 was unique in the respect of including a programme for village surveys. A total of 580 surveys are reported to have been undertaken in different States in India.1/ It is not clear how many of them resulted in published monographs. If all of them were available, the census surveys would account for more than half of the village surveys from sources other than the census listed in the bibliography on "Village Studies in India 1950-1975" prepared by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), Sussex.2/

2. These surveys have not received much attention despite their numerical importance. The IDS bibliography indicates that the coverage and quality of the surveys vary amongst, and even within, States and that those relating to Tamilnadu are among the better ones. Even so, a variety of reasons can be presumed for the relative neglect of the material. To start with, the quantity is forbidding; the surveys are thick in description but poor in analytical content making little effort to relate one set of facts to another; they contain few insights on changes over time; and the Census itself did not make any attempt to use these surveys to draw inter-village comparisons or to piece them together to form a picture of rural economy and society in the 1960s.

---

*I am very grateful to my colleagues K.Nagaraj and A.Vaidyanathan for detailed comments and suggestions for improvements. And, to C.Kalai Selvi and J.Robinson for secretarial assistance.

3. According to the Registrar General, the purpose of these surveys was "to try to invest the dry bones of village statistics with flesh-and-blood accounts of social structure and social change".[3] While the output has not succeeded in realising the stated objective, the Census surveys can be of potential value from a variety of considerations. They contain basic information that is of interest to students of socio-economic conditions in villages. The fact that data is furnished in a standardised format enables aggregation and inter-village comparisons. Caste-wise tabulations of several characteristics in these monographs are particularly useful for an understanding of village socio-political economy. Most importantly, the monographs provide a bench-mark for possible resurveys in the future.[4] Even without specific resurveys, the general picture that emerges from the material can be compared with more recent village surveys in the same State to obtain some idea of growth and change at the micro-level in the last quarter of a century.

4. As far as Tamilnadu is concerned, these surveys conducted between 1960 and 1963 are of particular interest in that they relate to the beginning of a decade which witnessed important changes in the development of the State: the introduction of the new agricultural technology, widespread rural electrification, pumpset-based growth in lift irrigation, and growing impoverishment evidenced by a large increase in the numbers of agricultural labourers.[5] The survey period was also the end of the first post-Independence decade which, in Tamilnadu, was marked by a significant increase in literacy and primary school facilities, the control of malaria, the establishment of statutory village panchayats and cooperative societies, and the introduction of the community development scheme. The Census surveys, as part of their design, have tended to take up interior and backward villages and might be of special value to researchers

who might take up resurveys addressed to the broad question of the degree to which the more remote and backward villages in the State have benefited from the further course of social and economic development.

5. These are the motivations behind this review of the 31 village survey monographs relating to Tamilnadu available from the 1961 Census.[6] In section I, we provide an introduction to the survey methods and the format of the monographs. The introduction deals only with essential particulars and a perusal of any one of the surveys will acquaint the interested reader with further details. Section II describes the typology of the villages according to their locational, physical, demographic, agronomic, occupational, and ethnic features. The Appendix contains on index to the 31 villages (in alphabetical order) giving the district of location and the reference to the relevant monograph number followed by a brief annotation on each village (arranged according to the districts in which they are located). Section II, along with the Appendix, will help the reader to get acquainted with the material. The subsequent sections pull together information from different places in the monographs to present a picture on three broad topics on which they appear to be most useful as source material. These topics are: (i) Basic needs viz., housing, drinking water, sanitation, health and literacy (section III) (ii) Poverty (section IV) and (iii) Caste, social relations and the Panchayat (section V). We have confined ourselves to these topics because of their intrinsic importance and also because they seemed to be the ones in which the effort of processing the material appeared to be commensurate with the possible interest of the findings.

6. In sum, our attempt in this paper --- to refer again to the Registrar General's phrase -- is to infuse some "flesh-and-blood into the dry bones" of the monographs in the process of over-viewing them as a whole. Limitations and inadequacies

in the survey data, to some of which we shall refer in the course of discussion, constrain the attempt. Nevertheless, the facts can be made to speak somewhat.

I. Introduction to the Surveys

7. The scheme of the surveys envisaged that about 35 villages would be chosen in each state so as to "represent adequately geographical, occupational and even ethnic diversity". However, there was "no intention to build up a picture for the whole State in quantitative terms on the basis of villages selected statistically at random".[7/]

8. The villages were to be selected from the following broad groups:

a) At least eight villages were to be so selected that each of them would contain "one dominant community with one predominating occupation e.g., fishermen, forest cultivators, potters, weavers, salt-makers, quarry workers etc."

b) At least seven villages were to include numerically prominent Scheduled Tribes of the State.

c) The third and largest group of villages was to consist of fair-size, old and settled villages with variegated occupations and, if possible, a multi-ethnic composition. The villages were to depend mainly on agriculture and be sufficiently away from the district administrative headquarters and business centres.

9. Common village and household schedules for the surveys were prescribed by the Registrar General in consultation with the State Superintendents of Census Operations and were adopted by them. The schedules are reproduced in the monographs. Likewise, a standardised set of tables for presenting data was adopted. In Tamilnadu, the schedules were canvassed in the villages during a month or more of field work by a team of two investigators, one of whom was a post-graduate degree holder. The draft report prepared by the team was scrutinised

and finalised by the Superintendent of Census Operations with the help of one of his deputies after one or the other had visited the village for gathering a general background. The field team also included a cartographer, a photographer and an artist for the preparation of maps, photographs and sketches to be used in the reports.[8/]

10. The surveys in Tamilnadu were conducted at various points of time during 1960-1963 but the exact period of each survey is not indicated in the monograph. Each of the monographs follows a set format of presentation and runs to between 100 and 200 pages. A useful feature of the format is that data is presented for different castes/communities in almost all the tables. The introductory chapter gives the location of the village, some material on flora and fauna, the settlement pattern, and the settlement history in terms of the castes and communities who were the early settlers and those who had migrated in the previous five generations or so. Maps showing the location of the village in the district and the site plan of the village are included in the chapter.

11. The second chapter is on "People and their Material Culture". It gives the caste/community composition of the village population, and information on language, ethnographical material on caste origins and on customs relating to life-crises (such as birth, naming, puberty, betrothal, marriage and death), family types, housing, ownership of consumer goods, dress, ornaments, diet and on drinking water supply, sanitation and facilities for medical and maternity care. Sketches of housing types and lay-outs and of ornaments are available in this chapter.

12. The third chapter on 'Population' is devoted to tables and discussion on demographic characteristics such as age structure, sex ratio and marital status and family types. Literacy, education and schooling facilities are also covered in this chapter.

13. The fourth chapter is on the "Village Economy". It is devoted to the work force and occupational classification, descriptions of important non-agricultural occupations being practised in the village, the cropping pattern, extent and mode of irrigation, agricultural implements and practices, ownership and cultivation of land, agricultural marketing, livestock, income levels and expenditure patterns, debt and credit.

14. The fifth and final chapter is devoted to 'Social and Cultural Life' and covers such topics as religion, festivals, inter-caste relations, practice of untouchability, and the functioning of caste and statutory panchayats. Many of the monographs also have data drawn from an attitudinal survey relating to family planning in this chapter.

II. Typology and general characteristics of the villages

Locations

15. The district-wise location of the 31 census villages can be found in the Appendix. The villages have been drawn from 11 out of the 12 rural districts of Tamilnadu in 1960. Five villages are from Salem, two of which are hill villages; four villages each have been chosen in Madurai (three hill villages) and Kanyakumari; three villages each in Tiruchirapalli (one hill village), Thanjavur, Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli; two villages each in Chengalpattu and South Arcot; and one village each in Coimbatore and the Nilgiris, both being hill villages. Kanyakumari is clearly over-represented while, in terms of plains villages, Madurai and Coimbatore are under-represented. North Arcot is not represented at all.

16. The seven hill villages are Hallimoyar and Nellithorai in the Nilgiris, Aladipatti in the Kalrayars, Periyur and Vilpatti in the Palnis, Sirumalai in the Sirumalai Hills, and Thenbaranadu in the Pacchaimalai. Sunnambukulam (on the Pulicat lake), Vilangulam (in Pattukottai taluk of Thanjavur) and Athangarai (on the estuary of the Vaigai in Ramanathapuram) are three coastal villages.

17. Of the 24 villages in the plains, 12 are on major roads while the rest are to the interior with quite a few being accessible only on cart tracks or foot paths. Except for Vilpatti and Sirumalai, the hill villages are also to the interior. Sixteen out of the 31 villages, or about half of them, are electrified.

Agro-economic patterns

18. It might be useful to begin by classifying the villages according to broad agro-economic types since it will help us to relate other characteristics to this framework. Four broad categories can be distinguished among the

villages in terms of irrigation and cropping patterns:

(i) "Substantially wet" villages with 80 per cent or more of the cropped area benefiting from irrigation mainly from rivers, canals or tanks connected to river or canal systems. Paddy is predominantly grown in these villages with coconut being the main crop in one of them. There are nine villages in this group.

(ii) "Partly wet" villages where irrigation is available for about 10 per cent to about a third of the cultivated area from tanks and/or wells.[9/] In the wet or garden lands, paddy and cash crops such as chillies, cotton, groundnut and vegetables are grown while in dry lands millets (ragi, cumbu, cholam), groundnut and gingelly are the main crops. In one such village, tapioca is grown on garden lands as a wet crop for the sago industry (Iswaramoorthipalayam) and another has about a third of its cultivated area under areca nut topes (Nellithorai). There are 12 villages in this category, including two hill villages.

(iii) Villages with little (up to 10 per cent) or no irrigation where almost the entire cultivation is of dry crops. There are seven villages of this kind, including three hill villages.

(iv) Three plantation villages in the hills where coffee, plantains, cardamom and citrus are grown. In one of them (Vilpatti) potato is also a major crop.

19. In eleven of the villages, non-agricultural occupations constitute a source of livelihood of some degree of importance. Their contribution to employment in terms of the work force engaged in these occupations varies from about 13 to nearly 70 per cent. The coverage of subsidiary occupations is quite wide: handloom weaving (silk, art silk, and cotton), palm gur preparation, palm leaf mat weaving, lime

shell collection, fishing (inland and marine), stoneware pot making, coir rope making, diamond dressing, tanning, beedi manufacture and collection of minor forest produce.

20. Table 1 gives the agro-economic classification of villages in terms of irrigation and subsidiary occupations. It will be seen that while subsidiary occupations are encountered in all types of plains villages, they are most prominent in the group of partly wet and predominantly dry villages. Out of the 11 villages in which subsidiary occupations play a role, only two are interior villages. Good communications providing accessibility to markets and to raw materials is clearly a factor of relevance here. The monographs contain descriptive material on crop husbandry and on major subsidiary occupations. Tables 2 and 3 provide a reference guide to the relevant monographs.

Diet

21. The dietary pattern reflects the cereals grown in the village and is also a function of income levels. Rice is the staple food where only paddy is grown which is the case in seven villages. In three villages, tapioca is the staple and in one (Vilpatti) it is potato. In all the rest, although paddy may be grown to some or even a large extent, millets (ragi and cumbu) are the main staple with rice being a supplement.

Settlement Patterns

22. All four basic village settlement patterns viz., dispersed, linear and nucleated clusters, and isolated homesteads, are represented.[10/] There are six cases of nucleated clusters but with the scheduled castes living in separate cheris or colonies. Even within the nucleated cluster, different castes tend to live in contiguous houses

forming blocks (e.g. Ayyangarkulam, Ravanasamudram). As is known, dispersed and relatively isolated clusters can be expected in hill villages with undulating terrains, low fertility, and either hoe or shifting cultivation. We have examples of this in Periyur (20 clusters), Thenbaranadu (16), Nellithorai (11), and in Aladipatti where there is one main village site and widely dispersed isolated homesteads. Dispersed homesteads located amidst coconut or palmyra groves are to be found in two Kanyakumari villages viz., Kootumangalam and Kottuthal Azhamkulam. Examples of linear settlements, around a hillock in both cases, are Thadagam and Kadukkara.

23. The most common pattern is the dispersed cluster constituted by a main or major habitation with a number of satellite hamlets ranging in number from two up to ten. Hamlets might have been formed in the course of successive phases of immigration and settlement or as a result of expansion from the core settlement in the process of population growth. The main village is usually habitated by the numerically, economically, or ritually dominant castes while the relatively smaller or minor castes tent to be found in the hamlets. There can be some fluidity in terms of the merger, disappearance and formation of hamlets and inter-hamlet migration in different periods (e.g., Arkasanahalli and Pudukulam). Inter-hamlet distances can be as much as four miles (Visavanoor) and communication between them difficult, especially in the rainy season (Pudukulam). In 15 villages which are of the dispersed cluster pattern, we can find a total of 76 hamlets or an average of five hamlets per village.11/ For comparable populations, dry villages (e.g., Arkasanahalli, Golwarpatti, Kanakagiri, Pappanaickenpatti, Visavanoor) tend to have larger numbers of hamlets, as compared to wet villages, as cultivable area is extensive and habitations tend to be dispersed among them, sometimes along water sources such as large tanks (e.g. Golwarpatti).

24. The dispersed cluster leads to problems of access to administrative, social and welfare facilities such as post offices, schools, dispensaries and especially drinking water wells which tend to be concentrated in the main habitation. Distance and difficulty in communication limit their utility to the hamlets. There is often inadequate provision of drinking water wells in outlying hamlets. Moreover, as we shall find while discussing Panchayats, in as much as hamlets tend to be caste-specific, the uneven spread of basic facilities is a reflection as well as a cause of caste rivalry.

Demographic Characteristics

25. The most populous village is Vilpatti (3189 persons) and the least populous is Hallimoyar (191 persons), both of them being hill villages. The average population size for all 31 villages is 1585 persons which is somewhat smaller than 1749, the average size of a Census village in 1961. On an average, the substantially wet villages have smaller populations (1253) as compared to partly wet (1580) or predominantly dry (1610) villages. The monographs do not contain area statistics to enable densities to be worked out but figures available in the 1961 census volumes indicate that population per square mile was of the order of 350 for the dry villages while it was in the 450 to 500 range for the wet and partly wet villages.

26. Household sizes vary from 3.6 to 6.1 but 21 out of the 31 villages lie in the 4.1 to 5.0 range. For all villages, the (weighted) average household size is 4.6, the same as that for rural Tamilnadu in the 1961 census. There is no significant difference in household size between substantially wet (4.5) and partly wet (4.4) villages but the predominantly dry villages have a distinctly higher average household size (4.8).

27. There is a wide variation in the proportion of joint families in the total number of households, from 2.9 to 23.1 per cent. Joint families are 15 per cent or less in 22 villages. The data, which gives the family types caste-wise, indicates that on account of housing difficulties, the poorer castes tend to have a higher proportion of joint families in quite a few villages (Arkasanahalli, Arkavadi, Ayyangarkulam, Pudukulam, Visavanoor).12/

28. The tables on marital status indicate that in general the age of marriage for girls is 15-20 years of age and for males is 20-25. There is a striking disparity in the proportion to total male/female population of (male) widowers and(female) widows. The proportion of widowers ranges from 1.9 to 6.8 per cent and is below 5.0 per cent in 26 out of 30 villages for which data is available while the proportion of widows is in the range of 6.7 to 19.4 per cent and is above 10 per cent in 21 villages. These are broadly consistent with the 1961 census estimates for the whole State of 3.6 per cent (widowers' proportion) and 13.7 per cent (widows' proportion). A number of factors account for the disparity, the most important of which is the prohibition of widow remarriage or its relative unpopularity or infeasibility. The significant incidence of widowhood has obvious implications for social security, training and rehabilitatory measures.13/

29. There is no systematic data or discussion in the monographs on population changes over time and the factors that might explain them. Many of the monographs note that the registration of births and deaths by village officials is unsatisfactory and unreliable.

Religious and Caste Composition

30. There is wide variation in the religious and caste composition of the villages. Taking religions first, Christians are to be found 19 villages, Muslims in 18 villages and both in 12 villages. In five villages viz., Kaduthachery (53.7 per cent), Pudukulam (47.4 per cent), Visavanoor (41.9 per cent), Kilakottai (41.8 per cent) and Kottuthal Azhamkulam (27.5 per cent), the Christian population is more than 20 per cent of the total. Except for Visavanoor, these villages are in Tirunelveli or Kanyakumari districts which together accounted for 39 per cent of the Christian population in Tamilnadu in the 1961 Census. The monographs provide information on the Hindu castes from which conversion had taken place to Christianity. In the majority of villages, it has been from the scheduled castes (Pallar, Parayar or Chakkiliyar) or from the service or fishermen castes (Mukkuva, Parava, Vannar, Vezhar). Exceptions consist of Kottuthal Azhamkulam (Nadar), Pudukulam (Nadar) and Visavanoor (Udayar).

31. Muslims are a substantial proportion of the population in Ravanasamudram (48.5 per cent), Athangarai (37.5 per cent) and Thiruvalavayanallur (30.8 per cent). In the first two of these villages they belong to the Hanafi (Rowther) and Shafi (Marakayyar) sub-divisions. Pattanis (Hanafi) of Afghan origin are to be found in Thiruvalavayanallur. In all other villages, Muslims are less than 10 per cent of population.

32. The scheduled tribes to be found are Pacchai Malayalis (Aladipatti, Pappanaickenpatti, and Thenbaranadu), Irulars (Hallimoyar and Nellithorai) and Pulayans (Periyur and Sirumalai). All these are hill villages except for Pappanaickenpatti which is on the plains but at the foot of the Kalrayans in Salem district. Tribals are predominant in these villages except in Sirumalai where the Pulayans are four per cent of the population and in Periyur where they are 33.8 per cent.

33. The number of castes to be found among the Hindus ranges up to 20, with 10 to 20 castes being encountered in the typical case. Considering Hindu castes and the original caste of Christians converts together, a single caste is predominant (i.e., 50 per cent or more) in 22 out of the 31 villages with the rest of the villages reflecting a wider multi-caste composition. Vanniars are numerically dominant in villages in the southern districts and in Salem: Sunnambukulam, Arkavadi, Thadagam, Arkasanahalli and Iswaramoorthipalayam. Other cases of villages where a single caste is numerically dominant relate to Nadars (Pudukulam and Kottuthal Azhamkulam), Sengunthar Mudaliars (Ayyangarkulam), Muthurajahs (Thiruvellarai), Kongu Goundars (Ariyur), Maravars (Athangarai), Nanjilnad Vellala Pillais (Kadukkara) and the immigrant Kerala caste of Krishnavagayar (Kootumangalam). Scheduled castes are numerically dominant in four villages viz., Kaduthachery (99.2 per cent being Christian and Hindu Parayars), Golwarpatti (90.2 per cent being mainly Christian and Hindu Pallars), Kilakottai (84.2 per cent being mainly Hindu Pallars) and Kunnalur (62.2 per cent being mainly Hindu Pallars).

34. Scheduled Castes (SC) are to be found in all except five villages, three of which are hill or tribal villages with the other two being in Kanyakumari district. There is much variation in the SC proportion amongst villages but on an average their presence is much higher in the wet and partly wet villages (24 to 27 per cent) as compared to dry villages (only about 3 per cent). Pallars and Parayars very largely predominate amongst the Scheduled Castes. Chakkiliyars, who nowhere exceed 5 per cent of total population, tend to be found in villages with lift irrigation where they find an occupation in repairing the leather kavalais or buckets. Another caste which is to be found in such villages is that of Oddars, traditionally engaged in well digging and road construction.

35. Artisanal and service castes to be found are Asaris or Kammalars (carpenters, blacksmiths, goldsmiths), Vannars (washermen), Navithar, Pandithar or Ambattar (barbers) and Kusavars or Vezhars (potters). Asaris predominate in this category while Kusavars are infrequent. Such castes are altogether absent only in one village viz., the hill village of Thenbaranadu. In other villages, they are typically no more than 5 per cent, and nowhere exceed 10 per cent, of total population. The relative incidence of artisanal castes is higher in the substantially wet villages (5.8 per cent) as compared to the partly wet or dry villages (2 to 4 per cent).

36. A few Brahmin households engaged in temple functions are encountered in several villages. They however exist in some size only in Ravanasamudram (10.4 per cent) and Thiruvellarai (3.5). Considerable Brahmin emigration has been reported in both cases.

37. The monographs contain material - fact and legend - on the origin of the major castes noticed in each village and on the customs practised by them at various stages of life based on sources such as Thurston's Caste and Tribes of South India, old Census Reports and District Gazetteers. Table 4 gives a list of castes for which such descriptive accounts could be found and the references to relevant monographs.

Table 1 : Agro-economic types in Census Villages

Typologies	Purely Agricultural or Plantation villages	Villages with subsidiary occupations
I. Substantially wet	1. Kadambangudi	1. Kootumangalam
	2. Kadukkara	2. Ravanasamudram
	3. Kaduthachery	
	4. Kunnalur	
	5. Pudukulam	
	6. Vilangulam	
	7. Thiruvalayavanallur	
II. Partly wet	1. Arkavadi	1. Ariyur
	2. Golwarpatti	2. Ayyangarkulam
	3. Hallimoyar (H)	3. Iswaramoorthi-palayam
	4. Kilakottai	4. Kanakagiri
	5. Nellithorai (H)	5. Thiruvallarai
	6. Thadagam	
	7. Visavanoor	
III. Predominantly dry	1. Aladipatti (H)	1. Athangarai
	2. Arkasanahalli	2. Pappanaicken-patti
	3. Thenbaranadu (H)	3. Sunnambukulam
		4. Kottuthal Azhamkulam
IV. Plantation	1. Periyur (H)	
	2. Sirumalai (H)	
	3. Vilpatti (H)	

Note: (H) indicates hill villages

Table 2: Material on Cropping Practices

Crop	Monograph
1. Areca nut	Nellithorai
2. Cardamom	Periyur; Sirumalai
3. Casuarina	Sunnambukulam
4. Citrus	Sirumalai
5. Coffee	Periyur; Sirumalai
6. Groundnut	Arkavadi
7. Paddy	Ayyangarkulam
8. Plantain	Periyur; Sirumalai
9. Potato	Vilpatti
10. Tapioca	Iswaramoorthipalayam; Kottuthal Azhamkulam

Table 3: Material on Subsidiary Occupations

1. Beedi rolling	Ravanasamudram
2. Coir Rope making	Kootumangalam
3. Diamond dressing	Thiruvellarai
4. Fishing	Pudukulam (inland); Sunnambukulam (inland); Athangarai (marine)
5. Lime shell collection	Sunnambukulam
6. Mat weaving	Arkasanahalli (palm-leaf); Ravanasamudram (korai); Thiruvalavayanallur (korai)
7. Minor Forest Produce collection	Hallimoyar; Pappanaickenpatti
8. Palm gur manufacture	Kanakagiri; Kottuthal Azhamkulam
9. Stone ware pot making	Iswaramoorthipalayam
10. Tanning	Ariyur
11. Weaving (Handloom)	Ariyur (cotton); Ayyangarkulam (silk); Kadambangudi (cotton); Kanakagiri (art silk)

Table 4: Material on Castes[1/]

Caste	Monograph
1. Ambattar (or Navithar or Pandithar)	Visavanoor
2. Asari	Kadukkara; Ravanasamudram
3. Bharathava Chetti (or Pattinavar)	Sunnambukulam
4. Brahmin	Ravanasamudram (Saivite); Thiruvellarai (Vaishnavite)
5. Chakkiliyar	Arkasanahalli; Ariyur; Kilakottai; Nellithorai; Sirumalai; Thiruvalavayanallur
6. Chetti, Beri	Sunnambukulam
7. Chetti, Telugu or Salupa or Janapa	Golwarpatti; Periyur
8. Christian	Kadambangudi
9. Gollas	Arkasanahalli; Pappanaickenpatti
10. Goundars, Kongu (or Kongu Vellala)	Ariyur; Kanakagiri; Isvaramoorthipalayam; Nellithorai
11. Idayar	Visavanoor
12. Irular	Nallimoyar; Nellithorai
13. Konars	Kadambangudi; Sirumalai
14. Krishnavagayar	Kootumangalam
15. Kuravar (SC)	Visavanoor
16. Kusavar (or Vezhar)	Kunnalur; Thiruvellarai
17. Malayalis	Aladipatti; Pappanaickenpatti; Thenbaranadu
18. Mannadiar (or Kunnuvar)	Periyur
19. Maravar	Athangarai; Golwarpatti; Visavanoor
20. Mudaliar, Kerala	Kootumangalam
21. Mudaliar, Sengunthar (or Kaikolar)	Ayyangarkulam; Kanakagiri; Thiruvellarai (contains references to Devadasi system)
22. Mukkuva	Kottuthal Azhamkulam
23. Muppanar	Ravanasamudram

Caste	Monograph
24. Muslims	Athangarai; Ravanasamudram; Sirumalai; Thiruvalayavanallur
25. Muthurajah	Kadambangudi; Thiruvellarai
26. Nadar	Kottumangalam; Kottuthal Azhamkulam; Pudukulam
27. Naicker, Thottiya	Sirumalai
28. Naicker, Thuluva	Thadagam
29. Naidu, Balija	Sirumalai
30. Naidu, Kavara	Pappanaickenpatti
31. Nair	Kottumangalam
32. Nattars (or Sembadavars)	Ayyangarkulam
33. Oddar	Thadagam
34. Okkaliga	Arkasanahalli; Hallimoyar; Nellithorai
35. Pallars	Golwarpatti (Kudumbar); Kilakottai (Veeranattar, Devandrakular); Kadambangudi (Kudumbar); Kanakagiri; Thiruvalavayanallur.
36. Pandaram, Jangama	Iswaramoorthipalayam
37. Pandaram, Valluva (SC)	Ayyangarkulam
38. Paravar	Athangarai
39. Parayar	Arkavadi; Arkasanahalli (Murasu Parayar); Kaduthachery (Sambavar); Kunnalur; Sirumalai
40. Pillai	Thiruvellarai (Choliya), Golwarpatti (Illathu), Ravanasamudram (Saiva), Kadukkara (Nanjilnad)
41. Pulayar	Periyur; Sirumalai
42. Reddiar	Arkavadi; Vilpatti
43. Servai (Kallar)	Kunnalur
44. Shanars, Kongu	Kanakagiri
45. Thevar	Kadukkara; Kunnalur; Vilangulam
46. Valayar	Athangarai; Nellithorai; Sirumalai

Caste	Monograph
47. Vannar	Visavanoor
48. Vanniar	Arkasanahalli; Arkavadi; Iswaramoorthipalayam; Kanakagiri; Sunnambukulam; Thadagam
49. Vania Chettiar	Kunnalur
50. Vellalas, Pandya	Sirumalai; Thiruvalavayanallur

1/ Sub-castes are given in paranthesis against the relevant monograph.

III Basic Needs

Housing

38. In general, most houses in these villages have thatched roofs and no more than a single room. Of 25 villages for which data is available, the proportion of thatched houses is 75 per cent or more in 16. The proportion of houses with no regular room or a single room is 75 per cent or more in 18 out of 30 villages for which data is available. There is a wide inter-village range in the proportion of houses that are thatched; from 17 per cent (Ayyangarkulam) to 100 per cent (Arkavadi). Ayyangarkulam is a weaving village where houses are also work-places with looms and tend to be better protected with tiled roofing. Easier availability of tiles would appear to explain the relatively large proportion of tiled houses in Kanyakumari and in some of the Tirunelveli villages (e.g., Kilakottai, Ravanasamudram). There are also wide differentials among castes (reflecting economic status) within villages in housing status (e.g., Athangarai, Thadagam, Thiruvalayavanallur, Thiruvellarai, Sunnambukulam, Vilangulam). All, or almost all, houses are thatched in a few villages because of the superstition that Mariamman would punish those who built tiled or terraced houses (Aladipatti, Arkavadi, Pappanaickenpatti).

Drinking Water

39. By and large, wells provide the source for drinking water. The exceptions are Golwarpatti (river), Visavanoor (ooranis or ponds) and Periyur (mountain springs). While the affluent can afford private wells, the poor have to rely on public wells; a number of situations illustrate the problems that the poor face in this respect. Public wells may be too

few in number and not available at all in some of the hamlets (e.g., Arkasanahalli) or separately for scheduled castes who are not allowed to draw water from public wells used by caste Hindus (e.g., Thiruvellarai).[14/] When they happen to dry up in summer, people have to depend on private irrigation wells and the goodwill of the persons who own them (e.g., Thadagam, Kilakottai). This dependency particularly affects the scheduled castes. In Thiruvellarai, for instance, "the Chakkiliyans of Kalavaipatty hamlet do not have any separate well and cannot also draw water from the public well from which the high caste Hindus of the village take water. The Chakkiliyans obtain their water from the nearby irrigation wells or tanks. When water gets dried up in these irrigation wells, the Chakkiliyans appeal to the members of the high caste Hindus who draw some water and pour it into the pots of the Chakkiliyans". In Kanakagiri, "no Harijan can take water from a public well located in caste Hindu localities. The Chakkiliyans have a separate bore well fitted with a hand pump which often goes out of order. On such occasions they are at the mercy of others". In summer, the other alternative is to use ponds, which get contaminated since they are used also for washing clothes and bathing cattle (e.g., Kunnalur). There is also the problem of carrying water from the wells to homes, a task that generally falls to the lot of the women and young girls, and can be particularly arduous in hill villages with water points in slopes and houses on higher ground (e.g., Sirumalai).

40. Wells, being open, do not provide protected water supply and get contaminated by the inflow of water used around them for bathing, washing clothes and cleaning of vessels (e.g., Arkavadi). In a few villages, protected supply is available from hand pumps or from overhead tanks with street connections but the problem is in their functioning. Supply from pipe connections in Thiruvellarai is restricted

and the tap in the "cheri" is "not useful because of distance and elevation". Out of nine hand pumps in Athangarai, eight were out of order. In Kunnalur too, pumpsets are "often out of order" forcing people to use the channels or the ponds.[15/]

Sanitation

41. Poor sanitary conditions have been reported in almost all the villages. The congested and irregular lay out of houses results in the accumulation of garbage at many points. Only in one village is the Panchayat reported to have arrangements to clear garbage (Iswaramoorthipalayam). Added to this is the problem of open drains and sullage, cattle urine and dung being a major source of it (e.g., Kilakottai, Kottuthal Azhamkulam). In most villages (Ravanasamudram being a notable exception), private latrines are few; in one village where some public latrines have been put up under the community development schemes, they are not in use (Golwarpatti). That industrial or occupational pollution need not be a purely urban phenomenon is illustrated in the cases of Kanakagiri where the starchy glue used by weavers is dumped in the streets, Athangarai where waste fish is the problem, Kootumangalam where the shallow pools used for retting coconut are breeding grounds for mosquitoes, and in villages where pigs are reared (Thadagam, Kottuthal Azhamkulam).

42. Civic sense is, no doubt, a factor in ensuring cleanliness. It differs from street to street, sometimes among communities, but no particular caste or community stands out as examplary. In the tribal village of Pappanaickenpatti, the Malayalis are reported to have a far better sanitation consciousness than their non-tribal fellow villagers: "Drain water does not collect and stagnate in the streets as far as Malayalee settlements are concerned. In contrast to this, non-tribal hamlets of old Pappanaickenpatti and Beemanpalayam give a dirty appearance and their streets are full of rubbish. They are usually never swept and drain water is permitted to stagnate".

Health

43. It is not surprising that, in these circumstances the prevalence of a number of water-borne and other communicable diseases is reported in most of the villages. Diarrhoea, dysentery and scabies are widely noted. Cholera is mentioned in most monographs; some find that its occurence is decreasing. The incidence of such endemic diseases is low in the Kanyakumari villages where homesteads are scattered (Kootumangalam, Kottuthal Azhamkulam). In as many as 14 villages, small pox, which has now been eradicated, has been noted as a regular feature, especially in the summer. Guinea worm (which recently was notified as eradicated) is a particularly painful disease afflicting field workers (Arkavadi, Thadagam). The encouraging development commented upon is the reduction of malaria which finds mention in as many as 15 villages and is of particular significance to hill villages highly susceptible to it.

44. Access to medical and maternity facilities is a function of several factors. In many villages, primary health centres or dispensaries are not available in reasonable proximity. Even if they exist in or near the village, they are not popular (e.g., Sunnambukulam, Thiruvalayavanallur). In some villages there are non-governmental dispensaries but beyond the means of the poor (Visavanoor). Allopathic medicine is becoming popular but its reach is limited. Only in eight villages, people are willing or able to benefit in the main from allopathy; in 12 villages, recourse is had to both traditional and allopathic systems; the other 11 villages depend primarily on native medicine, especially ayurveda or herbal treatment in the hill villages.[16/]

45. Maternity centres are reported only in a couple of villages (Ravanasamudram, Sirumalai); some others are near one but it is difficult to get the qualified midwife to attend

to deliveries (e.g., Golwarpatti). In 22 out of the 31 villages, most deliveries are unassisted, or attended to by untrained traditional dais.

Literacy

46. There is enormous variation in inter-village literacy levels, both male and female, particularly the latter. Male literacy rates (as per cent to total population) range from 10.0 to 76.7, female rates from 2.0 to 55.7, and overall rates from 6.0 to 66.4 with, in all cases, the hill village of Thenbaranadu and Kaduthachery in Kanyakumari representing the two ends of the spectrum.

47. In the 1961 Census, average rural literacy rates in Tamilnadu were 44.5 per cent among males, 18.2 per cent among females and 31.4 per cent overall. Inter-district variations ranged from 28.8 to 63.7 in male literacy, 7.6 to 45.6 in female literacy, and 18.3 to 54.7 in the overall rates with Salem (low) and Kanyakumari (high) representing the spread. Given these variations, it will be of interest to sort out the villages with reference to how they fare vis-a-vis the average rates for the district in which they are located. Table 5 gives the data. Out of 28 villages for which complete data is available, there are only eight villages which record literacy levels above their respective district averages in male, female or overall literacy with all three parameters being above the district averages in these villages. On the whole, therefore, the Census villages are backward literacy-wise.

48. There is a definite association between literacy and the availability of irrigation. The nine 'substantially wet' villages (vide Table 1) have an average overall literacy rate of 39.9 per cent, well above the 1961 State average of 31.4 per cent. Four out of these nine villages record rates above

their respective district averages. The average literacy rate for the 11 "partly wet" villages is 24.6 per cent and only three of them are above the district averages. The average literacy rate in the seven "predominantly dry" villages is as low as 16 per cent with all of them recording rates below the district average. It will be interesting to investigate the causal factors that might explain this relationship.

49. Low female literacy is a major cause of poor overall literacy. In the State as a whole, the female literacy rate (18.2) was 41 per cent of the male rate (44.5) in 1961. Nineteen of our villages record a lower percentage while nine are above this average. Very low female-male literacy ratios, of the order of 20 per cent or less, are to be found in some of the tribal villages (Aladipatti, Pappanaickenpatti, Thenbaranadu) and in villages in South Arcot, Tiruchirapalli and Thanjavur districts. In the Kanyakumari villages and in Hallimoyar, which has a tribal residential school, female literacy is 70 per cent or more of male literacy. It is interesting that in villages with a high proportion of Muslim population, female literacy as a proportion of male literacy tends to be better: Thiruvalayavanallur (38 per cent). This could be because Muslim girls do not go for agricultural labour.[17/] Given the variation between male and female literacy rates, the sex ratio has a bearing on the overall literacy rate, with an adverse or lower female-to-male ratio tending to improve the overall rate. This can be seen from Table 5 by comparing Visavanoor with Athangarai. The latter has a significantly lower male literacy rate than Visavanoor but maintains the same overall literacy because of its lower sex ratio, female literacy being the same in both villages.

50. Caste-wise differentials in literacy are significant with the scheduled castes and tribes and the most backward castes (such as Oddars) recording very low rates. In Table 6

we have presented some data. It shows that among the scheduled castes, Parayars and Chakkiliyars tend to fare worse than Pallars. It also shows that in villages where the scheduled castes are of substantial number and provided with schooling facilities, their literacy levels can be much higher than in villages where they are subjected to discrimination and neglect (e.g., Sirumalai, Kunnalur, Thiruvalayavanallur; also, Kaduthachery, Golwarpatti and Kilakottai where they are predominant (vide Table 5)). Christian missions have played a significant role in promoting school education in some of these villages. It is significant that as between Christians and Hindus of the same caste, the former record better literacy rates e.g., Golwarpatti where Christian Pallars have a rate of 37.3 as compared to Hindu Pallars with 21.3 and Kottuthal Azhamkulam where literacy rates are 47.0 and 30.0 respectively among Christian and Hindu Nadars.

51. The relationship between the existence of schools, in or near the village for a long time, and relatively good literacy levels is discernible. In the eight above-average villages, for instance, favourable factors have been schools in the village or in the urban neighbourhood (Ayyangarkulam, Kanakagiri, Sirumalai) or well-established old caste (Kunnalur, Ravanasamudram, Thiruvalayavanallur) or mission schools (Kaduthachery, Kilakottai). The two villages without schools in them have low literacy levels with reference to their district average (Kootumangalam, Kottuthal Azhamkulam). Residential schools for scheduled castes (Kilakottai) and tribes (Hallimoyar) have made a perceptible contribution in improving literacy. The expansion in primary schools in Tamilnadu in the 1950s is well reflected by the fact that in as many as 12 villages, schools have been established only after 1950.

52. The midday meals scheme was first introduced in primary schools in Tamilnadu in 1961. It was based on part contribution from the village community directly or through the Panchayat. Some of the monographs note that the scheme had improved enrolment. The number of children getting meals was however constrained by the inadequacy of public contributions; this sometimes led to the exclusion of the poorest from the benefit (e.g. the Harijan children in Ayyangarkulam) and in some cases to the requirement that children express their gratitude for the meal to their benefactors.

53. The correspondence between child labour (proportion of workers in the age group 10-14) and literacy can be noticed. In six out of eight of the above-average villages, child labour is relatively low, of the order of 15 per cent or less. The exceptions are the weaving villages of Ayyangarkulam and Kanakagiri which, despite high child labour ratios of 30 to 40 per cent, have managed to record relatively satisfactory literacy levels with reference to their district averages. Arkavadi, Sunnambukulam, Thadagam and Vilangulam illustrate that relatively low child labour ratios (of about 15 to 25 per cent) do not necessarily result in higher literacy as children although not working may not be in school either.

54. Literacy can be a good investment opening up opportunities for migration and employment in technical and blue-collar occupations outside the village. This is documented in a number of villages: Kilakottai, Ravanasamudram, Golwarpatti and in the Kanyakumari villages. It is heartening to find that the mainly Pallar villages of Golwarpatti and Kilakottai can boast of a number of emigrants who have obtained salaried jobs. School facilities in the village, openings for secondary education in nearby towns, scholarships and hostel facilities for the Scheduled Castes, and job reservations have combined to make this possible.

Table 5: Literacy Rates

District/Village	(Per cent to population) Male	Female	Total
Chengalpattu	40.7	12.4	25.8
*1. Ayyangarkulam	53.6	19.2	35.7
2. Sunnambukulam	25.4	8.4	16.8
S.Arcot	43.9	11.5	27.9
3. Arkavadi	26.8	4.4	16.3
4. Thadagam	31.9	6.7	19.7
Salem	20.8	7.6	18.3
5. Aladipatti	14.2	2.9	8.6
6. Arkasanahalli	13.8	4.7	9.0
*7. Kanakagiri	32.2	11.3	21.8
8. Pappanaickenpatti	14.7	3.1	9.1
Coimbatore	41.4	11.5	26.6
9. Nellithorai	24.9	8.0	16.7
Nilgiris	49.9	16.6	34.1
10. Hallimoyar	19.7	16.7	18.0
Tiruchirapalli	44.9	10.8	27.7
11. Ariyur	33.7	2.9	18.5
12. Thenbaranadu	10.0	2.0	6.0
13. Thiruvellarai	39.4	8.0	23.9
Thanjavur	51.1	15.8	33.2
14. Kadambangudi	40.6	9.4	25.4
*15. Kunnalur	53.0	18.8	36.4
16. Vilangulam	43.0	8.7	26.1
Madurai	47.7	12.9	30.2
*17. Sirumalai	46.7	19.7	33.6
*18. Thiruvalayavanallur	55.9	21.5	38.2
Ramanathapuram	50.7	13.2	31.3
19. Athangarai	34.8	14.5	24.5
20. Golwarpatti	38.7	10.4	24.6
21. Visavanoor	44.3	14.5	24.5

contd...

(per cent to population)

District/Village	Male	Female	Total
Tirunelveli	51.8	21.0	35.9
*22. Kilakottai	54.0	25.0	41.0
23. Pudukulam	50.5	18.7	33.3
*24. Ravanasamudram	56.5	26.5	40.0
Kanyakumari	63.7	45.6	54.7
25. Kadukkara	63.5	44.7	54.4
*26. Kaduthachery	76.7	55.7	66.4
27. Kootumangalam	57.0	43.0	50.0
28. Kottuthal Ashamkulam	43.9	29.6	37.0

Note: District figures indicate rural literacy rates in 1961. Data on complete enumeration basis is not available for Iswaramoorthipalayam, Periyur and Vilpatti.

* Villages in which literacy rates are above the district average.

Table 6: Differential literacy rates

Village	Overall literacy rate	Literacy among SC/ST/Most backward castes	
1. Ariyur	18.5	Chakkiliyar	3.0
2. Arkavadi	16.3	Parayar	8.6
3. Ayyangarkulam	35.7	Valluva Pandaram	13.5
4. Kanakagiri	21.8	Pallar	3.7
		Chakkiliyar	0.0
5. Kunnalur	36.4	Pallar	33.0
		Parayar	10.4
6. Nellithorai	16.7	Irular	5.4
7. Sirumalai	33.6	Chakkiliyar	22.9
8. Thadagam	19.7	Oddar	0.0
9. Thiruvalavayanallur	38.2	Pallar	23.0
		Chakkiliyar	13.0
10. Visavanoor	24.5	Pallar	9.3
		Chakkiliyar	5.3
		Parayar	4.2

IV Poverty

Data : availability and limitations

55. The data at different places in the chapter on the 'Village Economy' in the monographs makes it possible to attempt some judgments on poverty levels in the villages and to explore the relationship between the incidence of poverty and other aspects such as the pressure of population on land, the extent and nature of irrigation, intensity and pattern of cropping, land distribution, and the availability of subsidiary non-agricultural occupations.

56. We shall begin by noting the kind of data that is furnished and their principal limitations. The analysis of poverty has to be based on data on household incomes which are classified in five size classes of monthly income viz., upto Rs. 25, Rs. 26 to 50, Rs. 51 to 75, Rs. 76 to 100 and Rs. 101 and above. The number of households in each size class of income is given but not the household sizes, or the average household or per capita income in each size class. It is not possible therefore to work out inequality measures or attempt a head count poverty ratio. Moreover, in as much as the information has been collected in a short one-point official survey, recall lapses and biases in the data will have to be allowed for. In the absence of an explanation of the concept of income, we are not sure if income from such sources as gifts and perquisites, free collections (e.g. fuel) and home grown items have been systematically included. There is no information on seasonal conditions during the survey period. Most monographs contain information on land utilisation, modes of irrigation and the extent of land registered as wet or dry. Information is not available however on the actual extent irrigated or variations in it. In the case of lift irrigation, often only the number of wells are given. The cropping pattern is given

for the year of the survey but longer-term averages are not available. There is no information on yields or on output prices. Land holdings data are given in terms of households neither owning nor operating land (landless) and in terms of the number of households owning or operating land in five size classes viz., up to one acre, 1.1 to 2.49 acres, 2.50 to 4.99 acres, 5.00 to 9.99 acres and 10 acres and above. However the extent of land involved in these size-classes or the average holdings are not given making it impossible to work out inequality measures. Except here and there, we have no information on ownership or leasing-in by non-residents or of the extent of land owned or operated outside the village by residents. Information on the extent of land under tenancy is not available; so is the case with terms of tenancy and rental forms and rates. A few monographs provide some data on agricultural wages and on wages or earnings in non-agricultural occupations but not systematically or in any complete form. There is no information on duration of employment for agricultural labour. In a few cases, observations on land concentration are available but, on the whole, the investigators appear to have been quite insensitive to agrarian structure which is strange considering that the land ceiling law had been introduced in Tamilnadu around the time of these surveys.

Our procedure

57. With all these limitations, the availability of incomes data in a standard format, based on complete household enumeration, for 28 villages is an inducement to examine the relative incidence of poverty in this cross-section of villages and whether the evidence could be fitted into some framework of analysis.[18/] Needless to say, sophisticated techniques are ruled out given the nature of the data. Surmise and speculation have necessarily to help in drawing conclusions which could at best be suggestive.

58. We need first a working definition for the household poverty line. For this purpose, we use the well-known rural poverty norm of Rs.15 per capita per month in 1960-61 prices which is conveniently more or less contemporaneous with the period of the surveys. Applying the average household size of 4.6, this translates into Rs.69 per month as the household poverty line. Lacking distribution data in the usual form, it is not possible to interpolate for Rs.69 in the Rs.51 to 75 size class of households. Our way out, dictated by convenience, is to take the 'poverty proportion' or P as the average of the proportion of households below Rs.51 of monthly income and the proportion below Rs.76 of monthly income. This supplies one marker. The other, viz., SP, is the proportion of households below Rs.51 of monthly income which could be taken to be an index of 'severe poverty'. The procedure adopted is essentially pragmatic ("in the circumstances of the case") but may not be altogether impermissible as our main interest is not so much in determining absolute levels of absolute poverty but in ordering the villages in an appropriate manner to explore the contextual factors which might explain differing levels of the incidence of poverty.

Poverty in relation to agro-economic patterns

59. At a first level of analysis, we shall see how four main variables viz., poverty (P), severe poverty (SP), the availability of cultivated land per household (L/HH) and the proportion of households which are either landless (i.e. neither own nor operate land) or sub-marginal cultivators (i.e., owning or operating land below one acre) (L_1) vary in different agro-economic patterns that take into account irrigation, terrain and the availability of subsidiary occupations. Using the typologies in Table 1, the relevant data is presented in Table 7.

60. For all 28 villages, it is striking that P or our measure of the poverty proportion is as high as 72.4 per cent and the SP, or severe poverty proportion is 62.3 per cent. These proportions *prima facie* seem high but are not implausible. Some factors might have tended to push up the figures. The basic data could suffer from an underestimation of incomes; the income-related poverty line might overstate the poverty proportion in as much as consumption levels among the poor could exceed their incomes; in some of the villages, seasonal conditions might have been bad in the year of the survey although for Tamilnadu as a whole 1960-63 were normal years. On the other hand, the assumption of a uniform household size and the primitive interpolation procedure adopted by us might underestimate the poverty level. Overall, we have to remember also that the Census villages include a large number of dry, hill, and otherwise backward, villages with poor resources endowments and locational disadvantages.

61. Table 7 brings out an interesting distribution of villages, according to their agro-economic typology, around these averages. Not unexpectedly, the predominantly dry villages have the highest levels of P and SP. Relative to the substantially wet villages, L/HH is higher in these villages and L_1 is lower but lower productivity of land offsets these more favourable indicators to produce higher poverty proportions. Villages in this category with subsidiary occupations fare somewhat worse in terms of P and SP than purely agricultural villages. In their case, L/HH is much lower and L_1 is significantly higher. Subsidiary occupations have helped to compensate for these factors but have not been able to reduce poverty vis-a-vis villages solely dependent on agriculture. The two hill villages in this group (Aladipatti and Thenbaranadu) have favourable L/HH and L_1 ratios but, as we shall see later, are otherwise quite disparate. In averaging them out, we get misleadingly low levels of P and SP.

62. Compared to the dry villages, pressure on land is more intense and its distribution is more skewed in the substantially wet villages but higher productivity has presumably kept P and SP levels somewhat, although not appreciably, below levels in the dry villages. In this group as well, both L/HH and L_1 are significantly more adverse in villages with subsidiary occupations vis-a-vis the purely agricultural villages, and poverty levels are only slightly less striking. Once again, subsidiary non-agricultural employment has not helped to reduce poverty but only in preventing it from getting worse.

63. The partly wet villages are the ones which record on an average the relatively lowest levels of P and SP. In the agricultural villages (plains), a combination of higher productivity (vis-a-vis dry villages) and more favourable L/HH and L_1 (vis-a-vis wet villages) might explain this. The two hill villages (Hallimoyar and Nellithorai) have very high levels of P and SP, reasons for which we shall examine later. As in the case of the other two categories, P and SP levels in villages with subsidiary occupations are about the same as for the purely agricultural villages.

64. It will be useful to go beyond this broad analysis to a more detailed consideration of the different configurations of land and livelihood that might explain the incidence of poverty. For this purpose, we have grouped the 28 villages in four broad categories relative to the poverty proportion. The basic data is presented in Tables 8 to 11. The tables give the village-wise estimates for P and SP, the extent of irrigation, subsidiary occupations and their contribution to employment, availability of cultivated land per household (L/HH) and L_1, the proportion of households neither owning nor operating land or either owning or operating land below one acre (i.e., the landless and sub-marginal cultivators).

Category I consists of six villages in which P ranges from about 50 to 60 per cent. These are the ones with the relatively lowest incidence of poverty in the Census Villages. Category II consists of four "medium" villages where P is in the 60 to 70 per cent range. Category III consists of eight villages where P is 70 to 80 per cent i.e., where the poverty ratio is 'high'. Category IV includes 10 villages in which the poverty ratio is in the highest bracket viz., 80 to 99 per cent. We are now in a position to annotate some of the causal factors that might explain the relative incidence of poverty village-wise among and within these categories using the quantitative and descriptive material in the monographs.

The Annotation

65. The six villages in category I (Table 8) with relatively low poverty ratios constitute a mix of two hill villages (Thenbaranadu and Sirumalai), a wet village (Kootumangalam) and three villages of the partly wet type (Arkavadi, Kanakagiri and Visavanoor). Thenbaranadu is a hill village exclusively populated by Malayali tribals; land availability per household (L/HH) is high; the landless or sub-marginal cultivators (L_1) are low in proportion; and, although only millets are grown as a subsistence crop, severe poverty (SP) is low. In Sirumalai, although L/HH is favourable, L_1 is high, land being concentrated in fairly large estates. The reason for a poverty proportion of less than 60 would appear to be the availability of year-round employment in the plantations; however, the severe poverty ratio is distinctly higher than in Thenbaranadu. In Kanakagiri and Kootumangalam, L/HH is low and L_1 is high but subsidiary occupations viz., art-silk weaving in the former and coir-rope manufacture in the latter have made a sizable contribution to employment. This has maintained P in the range of 50 to 60 per cent. In Arkavadi and Visavanoor L/HH is

favourable and L_1 is quite low. Although irrigation is not extensive, adequate and diffuse ownership of land has been able to contain P in these two villages. Moreover, in Arkavadi opportunities for outside labour in road construction and other such work is reported to be available. The padial (or attached labour) system is reported to be widely prevalent in this village and might also be a factor in explaining a relatively low SP.

66. The four villages in category II (Table 9) with P in the range of 60 to 70 per cent are equally divided between wet and partly wet villages. Kadambangudi and Kadukkara are both substantially wet, growing two crops of paddy over most of the cultivated area. L/HH is favourable in Kadambangudi and L_1 is low but land ownership is reported to be concentrated. Kadukkara is low in L/HH and high in L_1; P might have been higher but for opportunities for outside labour in the surrounding estates. Thiruvellarai is somewhat similar to Arkavadi and Visavanoor in category I with a favourable L/HH and a relatively low L_1. Diamond dressing provides some supplementary incomes. However, these advantages seem to be offset by a high level of tenancy. One would prima facie expect a higher level of P in Thadagam because of its low L/HH and high L_1. Perhaps a good groundnut crop and favourable prices in the year of the survey might have helped; incomes from the felling and sale of timber from the nearby reserved forests (if included) might be another explanation.

67. The eight villages in category III (Table 10) with P in the range of 70 to 80 per cent consist of four wet, two partly wet, and two dry villages. Irrigation, although available to a substantial extent of cultivated land, is of poor quality in Vilangulam and Thiruvalayavanallur. The former is at the tail end of the Cauvery Mettur Project canal in Thanjavur and the latter at the tail-end of a tank

system linked to Periyar irrigation in Madurai. In both cases only a single paddy crop is grown. Land concentration is noted in both villages with absentee ownership and tenancy being high in Thiruvalavayanallur.

68. The quality of irrigation is much better in the other two wet villages viz., Pudukulam and Ravanasamudram enabling two crops of paddy to be grown. The reasons for a high P in Ravanasamudram are not difficult to identify. It has a particularly low L/HH and a very high L_1. Subsidiary occupations such as mat weaving and beedi rolling have not made any significant difference to the poverty level. The high level of P in Pudukulam is more difficult to explain. We have the indication that the village had been linked only a few years before the survey to the Manimuthar project. Conversion had only recently taken place from rainfed tank irrigation to a more stable irrigation regime. Low yields might be a factor in this case.

69. Ayyangarkulam and Golwarpatti are the two partly wet villages in this category with about a third of the cultivated area receiving irrigation from tank sources. Handloom silk weaving is a major subsidiary occupation in the former but it has not been able to reduce P because of the low L/HH and a high L_1. Both these parameters are relatively favourable in Golwarpatti but irrigation is of a much poorer quality, dependent as it is on a tank with only five months supply in contrast to Ayyangarkulam where two paddy crops over a much larger proportion of cultivated area are grown.

70. Sunnambukulam and Kottuthal Azhamkulam are very dry villages. In both, L/HH is low and L_1 is high. The poverty level is high in both villages despite subsidiary occupations making a good contribution to employment.

71. The largest number of villages are to be found in category IV (Table 11) where P is in the range of 80 to 100. Of the total of 10 villages involved, two are wet, two are partly wet with a low extent of irrigation, two are predominantly dry, and four are hill and/or tribal villages. Kadu-thachery and Kunnalur are the wet villages. A low L/HH and a high L_1 combined with high levels of tenancy and rent are features of the former. L/HH and L_1 are much more favourable in Kunnalur. Otherwise, however, the village is highly disadvantaged. It is at the tail end of the Cauvery system in Thanjavur and suffers from very poor drainage and very low yields. Added to these is a high level of tenancy in temple lands.

72. Among the partly wet or predominantly dry villages, a variety of situations operate. L/HH is favourable in Kilakottai and L_1 is not too high but the soil is poor and the village lies in a drought-prone belt. Athangarai has a high L_1 and, for its kind of irrigation, a relatively low L/HH. Fishing, as a subsidiary occupation, has not helped in keeping either P or SP at low levels. Irrigation is sparse in Ariyur and cotton spinning and weaving are low-earning subsidiary occupations of relatively minor importance. It is possible that land ownership is concentrated. These conditions appear to be exacerbated in Arkasanahalli where, although L/HH is favourable, there is little irrigation and indications of a high concentration of land ownership.

73. We finally come to a group of four hill and/or tribal villages where P is 85 per cent or more. In all these cases, the exploitation of the original tribal population by non-tribal immigrants comes out clearly from the monographs. Telugu Chettiars, Vanniars and Naidus control large extents of land in Pappanaickenpatti where most of the Malayali tribals eke out a living by collecting minor forest produce for low daily wages. The monograph notes 'within a period of

twelve months preceding the survey, the Malayalees of this village have parted with their lands to the extent of 40 acres. This has been going on year after year'. In Nellithorai, absentee Okkaliga owners control a substantial amount of the areca nut topes with the native Irulars being coolies or in Kumri cultivation. In Mallimoyar where L/HH is low, one single absentee Reddiar owns nearly a third of the land having acquired it from a forest contractor. No irrigation, poor soil, and informal leases are the features of Aladipatti. This group of hill villages with near total poverty stand in sharp contrast to the purely tribal, land-rich hill village of Thenbaranadu in category I with which we began the discussion.

74. This broad analysis can be supplemented to some extent with information on wages and earnings of agricultural and non-agricultural labour. For agricultural labour, data from nine villages dispersed in five districts indicate daily wages of Rupee one to Rs.1.5 for males and Rs.0.75 for females. In other words, an agricultural labour family with a male and a female worker earning between them, say Rs.2.25, would have to have employment for 28 days in a month for their household to rise above a poverty level of Rs.63.5 per month. This being clearly impossible, it is not surprising that P and SP among agricultural labourers is uniformly and distinctly higher than for the population as a whole. Most of the monographs give the household/income level data according to occupational categories and bring out clearly the relative deprivation among agricultural labour households. Among subsidiary occupations, handloom weaving is relatively more remunerative but even in this case monthly earnings for wage weavers of Rs.30 in Kanakagiri (art-silk weaving) and of Rs.30 to 50 in Ayyangarkulam (silk weaving) can not by themselves keep the households above poverty. Daily wages in lime shell collection (Sunnambukulam) or in diamond dressing (Thiruvellarai) are in the range of Rs.1.5 to 2.0. The mat-weaving

Muslim women of Ravanasamudram net no more than As. 14 (Rs.0.9) per day. The tribals of Pappanaickenpatti get Rs.0.75 per head load for carrying minor forest produce from the hills to the marketing centre in the plains.

75. The monographs also indicate that in the subsidiary occupations "putting-out" systems of different types operate imposing layers of intermediaries - merchants and/or money lenders - between the final market and the wage worker. This is documented for most such occupations: weaving (Ariyur, Ayyangarkulam, Kanakagiri), coir rope making (Kootumangalam), diamond dressing (Thiruvellarai) mat weaving (Ravanasamudram), lime shell collection (Sunnambukulam), jaggery making (Kottuthal Azhamkulam), fishing (Athangarai), collection of minor forest produce (Pappanaickenpatti) and stone-ware pot manufacture (Iswaramoorthipalayam). There is also evidence for the extensive use of child labour in some of these occupations such as weaving and diamond dressing.

A summing up

76. We have attempted to relate poverty levels to agro-economic characteristics first according to village typology and thereafter according to relative levels of the poverty proportion. The cross classification in Table 12 will help to sum up the variety of factors which interact with one another in influencing the incidence of poverty. Hill villages, while being clustered in category IV, are also to be found by exception in category I. Predominantly dry villages are all in categories III and IV, subsidiary occupations such as lime shell collection (Sunnambukulam), palmyra tapping (Kottuthal Azhamkulam) and fishing (Athangarai) notwithstanding. Some of the partly wet villages (Ariyur, Golwarpatti, Kilakottai) with a very low intensity of irrigation should also be considered on par with the predominantly dry group. Ayyangarkulam illustrates that even if a fairly remunerative subsidiary occupation such as silk weaving is

available, demographic pressure, concentration of land and low earnings could result in a high poverty proportion. Arkavadi, Thiruvellarai and Visavanoor do not have much irrigation but L/HH is favourable and concentration is low. These factors have enabled them to remain in categories I or II. The availability of subsidiary occupations seems to have helped in the case of Kanakagiri and Kootumangalam despite their low L/HH and high L_1. It is interesting that there are twice as many wet villages in categories III and IV than in categories I and II. That the quality and dependability of irrigation matter more than its mere availability is illustrated by Kunnalur, Pudukulam, Thiruvalavayanallur and Vilangulam where the irrigation regimes are inadequate or unsatisfactory. The last two of these villages are further burdened by tenancy. In Kaduthachery and Ravanasamudran where irrigation is satisfactory, demographic pressure is intense and land is highly concentrated leading to high poverty proportions.

77. Demographic pressure (evidenced by low L/HH ratios), ecological factors (extent and quality of irrigation and soil fertility), the distribution of land, the levels of tenancy and rents, low wages and earnings, whether in agricultural or non-agricultural occupations, are all, in generic terms, factors which contribute to the level of the poverty proportion. In specific terms, they interact variously in different village contexts and the "entitlement structure" differs quite widely from village to village.[19/] The monographs are useful in enabling us to map out these differences at least to a limited extent.

Expenditure, Debt and Savings

78. The monographs contain details of expenditure patterns income group wise. We have not found it worthwhile to analyse these data as the reliability of the information which has been

gathered in a short one-point survey is open to question. The obvious finding that the poor tend to spend a higher proportion of their incomes on food is brought out in most of the reports.

79. Data on the incidence of debt (i.e., percentages of household in debt) are given income class wise. There is also data on the causes of debt but they are not furnished according to income groups. Neither the incidence nor the extent of debt are related to landholdings. There is some but no systematic information on sources of credit. The material on interest rates is quite inadequate. In one case (Thiruvellarai) the data does not seem acceptable because the incidence of debt (at 18.4 per cent of households) is prima facie too low; in another case (Hallimoyar) the debt data are not furnished. In the other 26 villages, the incidence of debt ranges from 50 to 75 per cent of all households in 13 villages and from 75 to around 90 per cent in the other half. The average extent of debt per household is between Rs.300 and 500 in nine villages, Rs.500 to 700 in eight villages, and between Rs.700 and 1000 in nine villages. Tables 13 and 14 will show that, on the whole, hill villages tend to have a relatively lower incidence of debt and a relatively low extent of average debt per household.

80. While there is no significant difference in the debt incidence pattern as between the villages in categories I and II and those in categories III and IV, more than a third of the villages with higher poverty proportions (i.e., in categories III and IV) record relatively lower average values of debt per household (i.e. in the Rs.300 to 500 range) While the incidence of debt is a reflection of both poverty and relative affluence, the poorer are indebted, being less creditworthy, to a smaller extent. The debt of the poor is also incurred mostly for unproductive purposes and they are

more heavily involved in the sense of having high debt-to-income ratios. This is apparent within villages from the data available in the monographs.

81. The well known causes of debt viz., consumption needs, working capital for cultivation or trade, social obligations such as marriages and festivals, and investment on land are noted in the monographs. There is much variation in the causal pattern between villages. Private sources provide all, or the bulk, of credit in most villages. In many villages, cooperative credit societies do not exist and they nowhere meet more than 25 per cent of debt. We also have evidence that in terms of membership and functioning, cooperatives in many of the villages are dominated by the economically superior castes: Athangarai (Muslim), Kadambangudi (Udayars), Kadukkara (Vellalas), Kunnalur (Thevars) and Thiruvalavayanallur (Vellalas and Muslims).

82. We have no information on savings except that some of the monographs provide a so called "Prosperity Index" of households which have discharged debts or made savings or purchased land or houses in the last ten years. This is not useful as no distinction is made between gross and net savings and there is no similar measure of 'adversity'. Ornaments are a popular form of savings if the sketches are an indication but we do not know their distribution.[20]

Certain other aspects

83. Livestock can provide a useful income-earning asset for the poor. The monographs do not give details of livestock holdings in relation to income classes or occupational groups but only according to castes. In most villages we find that the scheduled castes or tribes own very few cattle and that cattle stock is concentrated with economically dominant land-owning castes. The scheduled and most backward castes (e.g., Oddars) however tend to own other types of livestock such as

goats, sheep, pigs and poultry. The exceptions are Ayyangarkulam, Nellithorai, Pudukulam and Vilangulam. Even where they own cattle, its quality may be poor as is reported in Ayyangarkulam: "The Valluva Pandarams (SC) seem to possess relatively more cattle per household than Mudaliars and other communities. But most of the cattle found with the Pandarams look very emaciated and are not capable of producing even a quarter of measure of milk per day. They just exist without any purpose. On the other hand, the cattle owned by Mudaliars are all improved stock and are capable of yielding anything between two or three Madras measures per day".[21/] The marketing of milk is confined to a couple of villages and is undertaken by traditional pastoral castes: Kadukkara (Konars), Ravanasamudram (Yadhavas). The latter village is reported to have experimented with a milk cooperative society which failed because "the producers preferred to sell milk directly to the tea shops which did not insist on good quality".

84. Rights in forest areas for grazing and opportunities for the collection of forest produce are issues that affect the poor in hill and tribal villages. These topics are touched upon in the monographs. The collection of minor forest produce such as gall nut, soap nut, tamarind, gooseberry and charcoal is auctioned to contractors who derive a good profit by employing the native tribals for low wages (Hallimoyar, Pappanaickenpatti) or may not employ them at all (Aladipatti). Access to grazing in reserved forests is at the mercy of the forest department which is especially strict with goats. The monograph on Aladipatti observes that the tribals do not benefit from the forests nor are they utilised in their development.

85. The proportion of old workers (i.e., the proportion of workers in population of age 60 and above) is high. In 18 or two-thirds of 27 villages for which data is available, this proportion is in the range of 40 to 60 per cent. In

eight villages it is higher than 60 per cent; of them, five (Aladipatti, Arkasanahalli, Kaduthachery, Pappanaickenpatti and Pudukulam) are in categories III and IV. The exceptions where a high proportion of old workers could be related to labour demand and to relatively low incidence of poverty are provided by Kadambangudi, Sirumalai and Thenbaranadu in categories I and II.

86. Finally, we can extract some observations on appearance and reality. The existence of a number of tiled or terraced houses, the presence of shops, and of cycles and radios in homes, or the absence of these are likely to be taken as indicators of prosperity or otherwise by visitors to villages. By collating the data on housing and consumer items in the monographs, it can be illustrated that such impressions, derived from casual empiricism, can be misleading. Five villages with relatively high proportions of tiled or terraced houses are in categories III and IV (Ayyangarkulam, Kaduthachery, Kilakottai, Kottuthal Azhamkulam and Ravanasamudram). There are few cycles and radios in Arkavadi, Kottumangalam, Thadagam and Visavanoor in categories I and II while the availability of such consumer items is much higher in Ariyur, Pudukulam, Sunnambukulam and Ravanasamudram in categories III and IV. To outward appearance, Sunnambukulam with 40 shops selling provisions, cloth, jewellery and a number of restaurants and tailoring establishments must certainly look prosperous but is in fact a dry village with a high proportion of poverty. This is not to deny that, by and large, consumer items or better houses are fewer in villages in categories III and IV; only that their presence or absence can mislead in a fair number of cases.

Table 7: Poverty according to agro-economic typologies

	No	P (percent of house-holds)	SP (percent of house-holds)	L/HH (acres)	L_1 (percent of house-holds
I. Substantially wet	9	75.3	67.4	2.7	62.1 1/
1. Mainly Agricultural Villages	7	75.9	67.7	3.4	53.6 1/
2. Villages with subsidiary occupations	2	74.0	66.7	0.5	81.0
II. Partly wet	11	68.7	56.6	4.0	45.2 1/
1. Mainly agricultural Villages (plains)	5	65.3	51.0	4.0	38.2
2. Mainly agricultural villages (hills)	2	89.5	86.4	4.7	53.2
3. Mainly agricultural villages (combined)	7	68.6	55.9	4.1	38.5
4. Villages with subsidiary occupations	4	68.9	57.5	3.8	53.2
III. Predominantly dry	7	77.5	68.6	3.6	53.6 1/
1. Mainly agricultural villages (plains)	2	89.2	85.6	5.4	31.5 1/
2. Mainly agricultural villages (hills)	2	62.3	47.0	6.0	20.9
3. Mainly agricultural villages (combined)	4	76.8	67.8	5.7	25.0
4. Villages with subsidiary occupations	3	78.4	69.5	1.3	76.8
IV. Plantation	1	59.7	46.9	5.8	56.2
V. All Villages	28	72.4	62.3	3.6	52.4 2/

1/ Excludes one village for which L_1 data are not available.

2/ Excludes three villages for which L_1 data are not available.

Table 8: Category I Villages

Village	Irrigation	P (per cent)	SP (per cent)	L/HH (acres)	L_1 (per cent)	Subsidiary occupations
1. Thenbaranadu	Negligible -- predominantly dry	47.7	26.7	6.8	18.2	--
2. Kanakagiri	About 15% of cropped area from tanks and wells	51.1	38.9	1.9	68.3	50.1 per cent of workers in weaving; 6.0 per cent in palmyra tapping
3. Arkavadi	About 26% mainly from wells	51.5	28.5	3.2	21.8	--
4. Visavanoor	Partly wet from rainfed tanks	53.6	36.2	4.6	30.7	--
5. Koottumangalam	Predominantly wet	56.4	43.6	1.2	80.3	A very large proportion of workers are engaged in coir-rope making
6. Sirumalai	Plantation	59.7	46.9	5.8	56.2	--

Table 9: Category II Villages

Village	Irrigation	P (per cent)	SP (per cent)	L/HH (Acres)	L_1 (per cent)	Subsidiary occupations
1. Thadagam	About 16% from tanks supplemented by wells	63.4	47.0	1.8	57.1	--
2. Thiruvellarai	About 17% mainly from wells	64.9	50.9	5.2	40.6	14.3% of workers are engaged in diamond dressing
3. Kadambangudi	Predominantly wet from canal and tank	65.8	53.7	3.1	34.4	--
4. Kadukkara	Predominantly wet from canal	67.4	59.0	1.0	70.0	--

Table 10: Category III Villages

Village	Irrigation	F (per cent)	SP (per cent)	L/HH (Acres)	L_1 (per cent)	Subsidiary occupations
1. Vilangulam	Predominantly wet from canal	74.0	66.7	3.5	NA	--
2. Pudukulam	Predominantly wet from systems tank	74.3	63.1	4.8	46.5	--
3. Thiruvalavayanallur	Predominantly wet from systems tank	75.0	67.4	2.2	58.3	--
4. Sunnambukulam	Predominantly dry with some well irrigation	76.4	67.0	0.9	75.9	40.4 per cent of workers are involved in lime shell collection and related activities
5. Ayyangarkulam	About 35% from tank and wells	76.6	66.0	1.0	73.1	69.1 per cent of workers are in weaving
6. Golwarpatti	About 30% from rainfed tank	77.6	67.5	4.2	39.9	--
7. Ravanasamudram	Predominantly wet from river	77.6	71.4	0.4	81.2	43.5 per cent of workers are in mat weaving, beedi-rolling and handloom weaving
8. Kottuthal Azhankulam	Predominantly dry	79.6	71.4	0.4	88.5	24.7% of workers are in palmyra tapping and jaggery manufacture. 31.9% are partly in agricultural labour and partly in palmy related activities.

Table 11: Category IV Villages

Village	Irrigation	P (per cent)	SP (per cent)	L/HH (Acres)	L_1 (per cent)	Subsidiary occupations
1. Kilakottai	About 10% from wells	80.4	73.5	5.4	41.5	--
2. Athangarai	Predominantly dry	80.6	71.9	2.4	70.6	25.6 per cent of workers are in fishing 23.5 per cent are in mat weaving
3. Ariyur	About 14% from wells	81.7	73.9	5.9	40.8	12.7 per cent of workers are in spinning and weaving
4. Kaduthachery	Predominantly dry with some well irrigation	84.4	76.6	1.0	87.7	--
5. Pappanaic-kenpatti	Predominantly dry with some well irrigation	85.5	80.7	5.3	31.5	28.1 per cent of workers are engaged in the collection and transport of minor forest produce
6. Kunnalur	Predominantly wet from river	87.9	83.3	5.9	39.3	--
7. Nellithorai	About 32% from river and wells	88.3	84.8	5.3	NA	--
8. Arkasana-halli	Predominantly dry	93.5	91.3	5.5	NA	--
9. Hallimoyar	About 33% wet	96.6	95.5	1.3	53.2	--
10. Aladipatti	Predominantly dry	98.5	97.5	3.9	27.5	--

Table 12: Poverty levels and agro-economic characteristics

Poverty category	Substantially wet		Partly wet		Predominantly dry		Hill and/or Tribal
	Mainly agricultural	With subsidiary occupations	Mainly agricultural	With subsidiary occupations	Mainly agricultural	With subsidiary occupations	
Category I	--	1.Kootumangalam	1.Arkavadi 2.Visavanoor	1.Kanakagiri	--	--	1. Thenbaranadu 2. Sirumalai
Category II	1.Kadambangudi 2.Kadukkara	--	1.Thadagam	1.Thiruvellarai	--	--	--
Category III	1.Fudukulam 2.Vilangulam 3.Thiruvalayanallur	1.Ravanasamudram	1. Golwarpatti	1.Ayyangarkulam	--	1.Sunnambukulam 2.Kottuthal Azhamkulam	--
Category IV	1.Kaduthachery 2.Kunnalur	--	1.Kilakottai	1.Ariyur	1.Arkasanahalli	1.Athangarai	1.Aladipatti 2.Hallimoyar 3.Nellithorai 4.Pappanaickenpatti

Table 13: Incidence of Debt

Percentage of HHs in debt	No of villages in categories I and II	No of villages in categories III and IV	No of Hill and/or tribal villages
50 - 75	3	7	3
76 - 91	4	7	2
	7	14	5

Table 14: Average debt per household

Average debt per HH	No. of villages in categories I and II	No. of villages in categories III and IV	No of hill and/or tribal villages
Rs.300 - 500	-	5	4
Rs.501 - 700	3	4	1
Rs.701 - 1000	4	5	-
	7	14	5

V Caste, Social Relations and the Panchayat

87. The religious and caste composition in the Census villages has been described in section II. In this section, we will use the material in the monographs to bring out certain aspects of inter-communal and inter-caste relations, particularly discrimination against the scheduled castes, and the ways in which the caste factor enters the functioning of formal and informal institutions in the village.

Inter-communal Relations

88. As noted earlier, Muslim and Christian populations live alongside Hindus in many of the villages; in some, they form a sizable proportion in the population. No case of communal discord is mentioned in any of the monographs. There is "rivalry" between Hindus and Muslims in Athangarai but no "hostility". Thiruvalavayanallur has had a major communal riot in 1922 but amicable relations have prevailed between Hindus and Muslims in the last several years. An off shoot of these troubles has been the emigration of many Muslim families; another might be the exclusion, even in 1960, of Muslims from the village panchayat.

Christianity and Caste

89. There are taboos on inter-marriage between the three Muslim groupings (Shafi, Hanafi and the Pattanis) but no reflection amongst Muslims of caste divisions carried over from Hinduism. Christians are notably different in this respect in that they continue to identify themselves according to the Hindu caste from which conversion had taken place. In social relations, as the monograph on Kottuthal Azhamkulam puts it, "caste rather than religion is operative. There is more intercourse between Catholic Nadars and Hindu Nadars than

between Catholic Mukkuvas and Catholic Nadars." In Kootumangalam, "a Christian Nadar would have no objection to marry a Hindu Nadar but he would not think of marrying a Christian Kerala Mudaliar. A Christian Nadar would interdine with a Hindu Nadar but would not do so with a Christian barber". In Golwarpatti and Kaduthachery religion does not stand in the way of inter-marriages between Hindu and Christian Pallars.

90. In some villages, conversion to Christianity has followed the intercession of Christian missionaries on behalf of tenants protesting against high rents (Golwarpatti) or on behalf of agricultural labourers suffering from landlord oppression (Ariyur). In the latter village, in the early part of the century, "a Goundar landlord hit a Chakkiliyan labourer for non-repayment of debt. The Chakkiliyans en masse stopped away from work in Goundars' fields. Then came a Christian missionary from Dharapuram who started some rehabilitatory measures and established a school in the cheri. A few Chakkiliyans became Christians. But when he left the village, the Chakkiliyans agreed to work for their old masters and returned to Hinduism". While reconversion to Hinduism has taken place under economic pressure in this case, economic privileges available for scheduled castes in the 1950s have induced reconversions in Golwarpatti and Kaduthachery. As the monograph on the latter village describes it, "the conversion from Christianity to Hinduism is simple as there is no formal ceremony. All that one has to do is to stop going to the Church and to stop paying donations to the Church with a declaration to that effect. He is recognised as a Hindu the moment he starts making contributions to the Hindu festivals in the village".

Discrimination

91. There is a great deal of evidence in the monographs of discrimination against the scheduled castes and of the

many forms it can take. Very few, including among the scheduled castes themselves, are aware of the provisions of the Untouchability Offences Act as evidenced by the surveys relating to Arkasanahalli, Arkavadi, Kadambangudi, Kadukkara, Kanakagiri, Sirumalai, Thadagam, and Vilangulam. In some villages - Athangarai, Sunnambukulam, Thiruvalavayanallur - awareness of legislative prohibitions is high but it has not prevented the practice of discrimination.

92. Discrimination is wide and comprehensive. It is practised in regard to segregation of dwelling in all villages where scheduled castes are present. Furthermore, in Arkavadi "cheri dwellers are not allowed to build more commodious houses than the higher castes".[22/] Discrimination in the use of wells and ponds for drinking water is documented in Ariyur, Ayyangarkulam, Kanakagiri, Sirumalai and Thiruvellarai. In the latter village, the caste Hindus of the Salapatty hamlet were prepared to cut the nose to spite the face as they "could not use a new well under the rural water supply scheme because a Chakkiliyan had taken water from it". Discrimination in temple entry is noted in a number of cases. In Kanakagiri, "no Harijan dares to enter the Velayudaswami temple". While being permitted to enter temples in Ayyangarkulam, "out of bitter experience and because of the treatment meted out from time to time, they (the Harijans) enter them with obvious reluctance and caution". Thiruvellarai is proud of its early Chola temple of the 3rd century but the Harijans ("Children of God"!) in this village have been severely victimised for claiming access to it: "When Shri R.S.Malayappan IAS was camping in this village, he collected all the Harijans and entered the temple along with them. The Hindus of this village and the neighbouring villages were much outraged by the incident. They boycotted the Harijan labourers for a year. It was only after the Harijans tendered their apology and assured them that they would continue to behave in the traditional fashion that the caste Hindus employed them as coolies".[23/]

As in temples, so in tea shops where "they are served in separate plates and tumblers" (Ayyangarkulam and Thadagam). In general, the scheduled castes are not allowed to enter the houses of caste Hindus or to walk with sandals in streets inhabited by them although such practices are reported to be weakening in a few villages (Ayyangarkulam, Kunnalur, Thiruvalayavanallur) where they form a substantial proportion in the population.[24/] There are some cases where the Harijan children have been denied mid day meals in schools (Ayyangarkulam) or are seated separately in the classes (Arkavadi, and Ariyur where the pressure of higher castes on the teachers is given as the reason for the practice). Economic discrimination against Harijans has been noted in terms of entry barriers in engaging them as wage workers in weaving (Ayyangarkulam and to a lesser extent, Kanakagiri) and in other occupations such as diamond dressing where the Parayars have been employed in only one of the many workshops in Thiruvellarai, the exception being one owned by a Muslim from a neighbouring village. Some forms of such discrimination are also practised by one scheduled caste against another. In Kanakagiri, "the Pallars have a separate well. They will not allow Chakkiliyars to use it"; in Kunnalur, a Vaikkarar (Pallar) is reported to have been fined by his caste panchayat for inter-dining with a Parayar.

Caste Panchayats

93. The monographs contain interesting information on the functioning of caste (jati or kula) panchayats. The main responsibilities and concerns of these caste-related informal institutions are settlements of disputes within the caste, the upholding of caste norms of behaviour, maintenance of caste solidarity in its external relations, and the promotion of caste welfare.[25/] Caste panchayats need not be confined to the village jurisdiction but can operate in

hierarchical structures over several villages in which the same caste is present. Examples of this are available for Sengunthar Mudaliars (Ayyangarkulam), Okkaligas (Arkasanahalli) and Malayalis (Aladipatti). In some cases, the functions of the caste panchayat may be discharged by one or more elders or headmen ('authority figures') variously known as Moopan (for Malayalis), Oor Gounden (Vanniars and Kongu Vellalas), Palavan (Pallars), Ejamanan (Parayars) or generally as Periathanakaran or Nattanmaikaran. Muslims and Christians also have caste panchayats.

94. The existence and strength of caste panchayats varies amongst villages and communities. In the Census villages, caste panchayats are generally reported to be active among communities which are numerically weaker in the village but in sufficient number to need an organisation for promoting cohesiveness. E.g., Kootumangalam (among Nadars), Sunnambukulam (Pattinavas) Thiruvalayavanallur (Pallars and Chakkiliyars). In many villages, caste panchayats are reported to be weak or subject to "erosion" by the statutory panchayat.[26/] The latter situation obtains in a village like Thenbaranadu which is exclusively populated by a single tribe as also in cases where a dominant caste takes over the functions of the caste panchayat for the whole village (Pudukulam, Vilpatti). In one case (Iswaramoorthipalayam), an informal multi-caste panchayat deals with dispute settlements. We also find that smaller and weaker castes tend to refer disputes within them to the economically dominant castes for settlement (Athangarai, Visavanoor). Inter-caste disputes can not, of course, be settled by a panchayat confined to one of the castes and will have to be arbitrated in a wider forum. When this happens, the norms followed reflect caste hierarchy in the village. As the Visavanoor monograph points out: "if a man commits adultery with a girl of higher caste it is considered as a threat to the status quo of the whole village society. Ex-communication

is the automatic punishment in all such cases. But if a higher caste man has any illicit relationship with a girl of Adi-dravidas, the sentiments will not be as strong and mild punishments will be given".[27/]

95. Common welfare funds being administered by caste panchayats or on a caste basis have been reported in a few villages: Golwarpatti, Kilakottai, Ravanasamudram and Thiruvalavayanallur. The Pallars of Thiruvalayavanallur run a caste chit fund to which collections are made on the basis of 50 paise per member per month and the amounts auctioned at nominal interest to those in need. "In the first year, the fund has helped one member to buy a ploughing buffalo, another a cow, and the community dhobi to construct a house". Caste roots are long-lasting despite time and distance: in Ravanasamudram, expatriate Brahmins of the village who have found jobs in "Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras" subscribe to a welfare fund from which contributions are made not only to the school, maternity centre and temple but also for scholarships for "Brahmin boys".

96. The monographs provide a couple of examples where political affiliations tend to be caste-based reflecting broad class interests. In Ayyangarkulam, "the Sengunthars are solidly behind the Congress. Nattars and Asaris support the DMK. Quite a few of the Valluva Pandarams (SC) belong to the Communist Party". In Pudukulam, the relatively affluent Maravars and Konars supported the Swatantra party in the 1962 elections, while the Nadars voted for the Congress.

Caste and the Panchayat

97. Caste factors widely affect elections to statutory panchayats, their composition, and their functioning in a manner that is equitable to different hamlets in the village which may be caste-differentiated. Caste rivalry during

elections has been reported in a number of cases: Aladipatti, Arkasanahalli, Kanakagiri, Kilakottai, Kunnalur and Pudukulam. In situations where there is a strong rivalry between two leading castes, it is usual for one of them to coopt the scheduled and most backward castes on their side (Kanakagiri, Pudukulam). Rivalry during elections impedes the smooth functioning of the Panchayat (Kanakagiri) or results in the neglect of hamlets habitated by the losing faction (Kilakottai, Kunnalur).

98. There are several examples of Panchayats dominated by castes which are economically dominant although they may not be numerically the largest: Athangarai (Maravars), Kadambangudi (Udayars) Visavanoor (Muslims and Maravars).28/ This is particularly the case in some of the tribal villages: Hallimoyar (Okkaligas), Nellithorai (Badagas) and Periyur (Mannadis). In Ariyur (Kongu Goundars), Ayyangarkulam (Sengunthars), and Iswaramoorthipalayam (Vanniars) there is a coincidence in the same caste of economic and numerical superiority. There are only a few cases where a numerically larger, but economically weaker, caste is dominant in the Panchayat: Sunnambukulam (Vanniars) and Pappanaickenpatti (Malayalis). Scheduled Castes and artisanal and service castes, are altogether excluded or marginalised in a number of Panchayats: Kanakagiri (SCs), Thadagam (Oddars and SCs), Thiruvalayavanallur (SCs) and the native tribals in Hallimoyar, Nellithorai and Periyur. There are informal understandings in a few villages on the sharing of seats in the Panchayat based on community and caste proportions: Kunnalur, Thiruvellarai, Ravanasamudram. This system of consensus is reported to be working well. In the predominantly SC village of Golwarpatti, the members of the statutory panchayat are chosen by the elders of the caste panchayat. Efficiency and equity vary in the functioning of panchayats but wider participation does not seem to be a necessary condition for effective functioning as is illustrated by the "well-administered" panchayats of Ariyur, Iswaramoorthipalayam and Kunnalur in which important castes are under-represented.

Notes and References

1/ The figure of 580 Census surveys is reported in S.C. Srivastava Indian Census in Perspective Registrar General, India 1971 p.60.

2/ Claire M.Lambert (ed) Village Studies, Data Analysis and Bibliography, Volume 1: India 1960-1975 Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex 1976 (IDS bibliography) lists a total of 1312 village studies of which 266 are Census monographs and 1046 are from sources other than the Census.

3/ Common introduction to Census of India 1961 Volume IX Part VI Village Survey Monographs by Registrar General, India.

4/ It is understood that four villages in Tamilnadu were resurveyed in 1971 but that none of them reached the publication stage. The Census authorities intend to resurvey three of the Tamilnadu villages as part of the 1981 Census programme, the villages chosen being Aladipatti, Thiruvellarai, and Visavanoor.

5/ For a study of this period see C.T.Kurien Dynamics of Rural Transformation : A Study of Tamilnadu 1950-1975 Orient Longman 1981.

6/ Forty villages were chosen in Tamilnadu for the Census 1961 surveys but only 31 surveys were published.

7/ Registrar General's introduction op.cit.

8/ Introduction by the Superintendent for Census Operations Tamilnadu to the Census 1961 Village Survey Monographs.

9/ In most of these villages, the extent of pumpset irrigation in the early 1960s was quite limited. Out of an available total count of 895 wells, only 93 are reported to be equipped with pumpsets of which 53 were electrified.

10/ For a discussion of village settlement patterns see Census of India 1961 Volume I Part IV-a(iii) Report on House Types and Village Settlement Patterns in India pp.7-11.

11/ In Tamilnadu as a whole there are about 54,000 hamlets in about 16,000 revenue villages.

12/ This is an interesting qualification to the hypothesis that the process of nucleation is more pronounced among the poor than the rich. See N.Krishnaji 'Agrarian

Structure and Family Formation: A Tentative Hypothesis' in Economic and Political Weekly March 29, 1980.

13/ According to estimates in NSS Report No.76 (14th Round 1958-59) a strikingly high proportion, viz., 63.1 per cent of females of age 45 or above are widowed in rural Tamilnadu (Table 4.11.1 p.76).

14/ Inadequate drinking water wells in Harijan colonies is not a thing of the past. See S.Guhan and Joan Mencher Iruvelpattu Revisited Madras Institute of Development Studies (MIDS) 1982.

15/ Effective access to public drinking water facilities gets restricted because of both maldistribution and malfunctioning. For illustrations from two recent surveys see S.Guhan Palakurichi : A Resurvey MIDS 1983 and S.Guhan and K.Bharathan Dusi : A Resurvey MIDS 1984.

16/ On preferences relating to different systems of medical treatment G.Djurfeldt and S.Lindberg Pills Against Poverty: A study of the introduction of Western medicine in a Tamil village University of Lund 1974 will be of interest.

17/ High female vis-a-vis male literacy among Muslims has also been noticed in S.Guhan and K.Bharathan Dusi: A Resurvey MIDS 1984.

18/ Data has been gathered only for a piece-meal sample in three of the surveys viz., Iswaramoorthipalayam (Salem), Periyur (Madurai) and Vilpatti (Madurai).

19/ For a discussion of 'Poverty and Entitlements' see Amartya Sen : Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation Oxford 1981 Chapter 1.

20/ The monographs could provide a useful source for documenting types of ornaments worn by women of different castes and across villages. The pampadam, which essentially consists of gold cubes loaded on to the ear lobes, appears to be particularly popular; this may be so because it admits of easy additions or disinvestment.

21/ Dominant cattle owners may also be in a position to obtain a better price for the milk they sell. See S.Guhan and Joan Mencher Iruvelpattu Revisited MIDS 1982.

22/ Dominant landlords could even prevent Government from acquiring housesites for Harijans. See S.Guhan and Joan Mencher Iruvelpattu Revisited MIDS 1982.

23/ Shri R.S.Malayappan IAS was the Collector of Tiruchirapalli in the mid-1950s. He was himself a Harijan and a keen social reformist.

24/ It is from a S.Arcot village (Arkavadi) that we get the following graphic description: "The Parayan goes in his traditional way addressing higher caste people as '<u>Sami</u>' or master and speaks to them most respectfully in a cringing or obsequious manner. At the sight of a member of a higher caste the Paraya has to remove his head gear and tie it round his waist as a mark of respect. He is also not expected to walk into the main settlement of the village, where the people of the higher castes live, with sandals on and while addressing a member of any other caste he should stand at a minimum distance of six feet. An accidental touch of the Paraya caste man is considered to be a bad thing and to be rid of the evil effects the higher caste man has to take a dip in water with all the clothes worn by him at the time".

25/ For a discussion of <u>jati</u> panchayats and other references to this subject see Upendra Baxi <u>The Crisis of the Indian Legal System</u> Vikas 1982 pp 334 et seq.

26/ For an interesting case of a political party taking over the functions of a caste panchayat see S.Guhan <u>Palakurichi: A Resurvey</u> MIDS 1983.

27/ For similar instances see Kathleen Gough <u>Rural Society in Southeast India</u> Cambridge University Press 1981 Chapter 17 (particularly case 3).

28/ For a striking example of such dominance from a recent survey see S.Guhan <u>Palakurichi : A Resurvey</u> MIDS 1983.

Index to Villages

Village	District	Monograph No.
1. Aladipatti	Salem	18
2. Ariyur	Tiruchirapalli	31
3. Arkasanahalli	Salem[1/]	3
4. Arkavadi	S.Arcot	27
5. Athanagarai	Ramanathapuram	12
6. Ayyangarkulam	Chengalpattu	1
7. Golwarpatti	Ramanathapuram	26
8. Hallimoyar	Nilgiris	20
9. Iswaramoorthipalayam	Salem	17
10. Kadambangudi	Thanjavur	15
11. Kadukkara	Kanyakumari	13
12. Kaduthachery	Kanyakumari	16
13. Kilakottai	Tirunelveli	21
14. Kanakagiri	Salem	6
15. Kootumangalam	Kanyakumari	8
16. Kottuthal Azhamkulam	Kanyakumari	19
17. Kunnalur	Thanjavur	11
18. Mellithorai	Coimbatore	23
19. Pappanaickenpatti	Salem	22
20. Periyur	Madurai	24
21. Pudukulam	Tirunelveli	10
22. Ravanasamudram	Tirunelveli	7
23. Sirumalai	Madurai	29
24. Sunnambukulam	Chengalpattu	28
25. Thadagam	S.Arcot	9
26. Thenbaranadu	Tiruchirapalli	2
27. Thiruvalavayanallur	Madurai	30
28. Thiruvellarai	Tiruchirapalli	4
29. Vilangulam	Thanjavur	25
30. Vilpatti	Madurai	5
31. Visavanoor	Ramanathapuram	14

1/ Now Dharmapuri

Appendix

Annotated Index to Census Villages, 1961

Chengalpattu

1. Ayyangarkulam (Monograph No.1). Five miles from Kancheepuram town off Kancheepuram - Vandavasi road, Kancheepuram taluk. Main village with Harijan colony. Electrified. Population 1437 in 335 HHs. Major castes : Sengunthar Mudaliar (62.6 per cent), Nattar (14.3) and Valluva Pandarams (SC) (9.8). Handloom silk weaving major source of non-agricultural employment. Tank and well irrigation. Mainly paddy cultivation. Panchayat dominated by Sengunthars.

2. Sunnambukulam (M.No.28). 6½ miles from Gummidipundi, Ponneri taluk. Adjoins Pulicat lake. Main village and four hamlets. Electrified. Population 2331 in 532 HHs. Major castes : Vannia Reddiars (55.0), Bharathava Chettis (18.0) and Beri Chettis (12.0). Lime shell collection provides important source of subsidiary employment; the industry is dominated by a few Beri Chettis. No irrigation except for a few wells. Paddy, dry crops and casuarina. Vanniars dominant in Panchayat.

South Arcot

3. Arkavadi (M.No.27). Interior village 6 miles from Manulurpet on Thiruvannamalai - Thirukoilur road, Kallakurichi taluk. Main village with Harijan colony. Not electrified. Population 728 in 150 HHs. Major castes : Vanniars (58.0), Reddiars (14.0), Parayars (SC) (14.0), Konars (6.5). Limited irrigation from wells and channel from Musukundha river. Groundnut, millets and paddy. Vanniars dominant in Panchayat.

4. Thadagam (M.No.9). Interior village 19 miles from Gingee and 3½ miles from nearest roadside village of Nallanpillai-petral, Gingee taluk. Linear settlement around hillock. Adjoins reserved forest. Not electrified. Population 1404 in 303 HHs. Major castes: Vannia Goundars (77.0), Oddars (9.0), Thuluva Naickers (8.0). Tank and well irrigation. Groundnut, millets, paddy. Collection of firewood from reserved forest is source of supplementary income. Vanniars dominant in Panchayat.

Salem

5. Aladipatti (M.No.18). Hill village at altitude of 2500 feet on Arunoothumalai, Salem taluk. Kombur at foot hills is 17 miles from Salem on Harur road. Main settlement within walled enclosure with huts scattered among fields. Not electrified. Population 709 in 160 HHs. Mainly populated by Malayalis (ST). No irrigation. Millet cultivation. Telugu chettiars control informal land leases.

6. Arkasanahalli (M.No.3). Interior village 6 miles from Thoppur Ghats on Madras-Calicut road, Dharmapuri taluk. Main village with 6 hamlets. Not electrified. Population 1486 in 298 HHs. Major castes: Vanniars (53.5), Okkaligas (15.3), Gollas (14.7), SC (Mainly Murasu Parayar, 12.1). Limited irrigation from wells on river bed of Nagavathi and percolation wells. Millets and paddy. Vanniars and Okkaligas dominant in Panchayat.

7. Iswaramoorthipalayam (M.No.17). 16 miles from Attur on Attur-Rasipuram road, Rasipuram taluk. Main village and one hamlet. Electrified. Population 2351 in 535 HHs. Major castes: Vanniars, Kurumbars, Jangama Pandaram and Kongu Vellalas. Well irrigation covers about a fourth of cultivated area. Tapioca (introduced by Kongu Vellalas) grown

in garden lands as cash crop for sago industry; millets in dry lands. Weaving and stone ware pot (kalchatti) manufacture are subsidiary occupations. Panchayat and cooperative society dominated by Vanniars.

8. Kanakagiri (M.No.6). 12 miles from Salem on Madras-Calicut highway, Sankari taluk. Main village and 6 hamlets. Electrified. Population 1537 in 325 HHs. Main castes : Vanniar (20.6), Kongu Shanars (17.6), Kongu Goundars (17.2), Sengunthar Mudaliars (14.2), SC (Pallar, Chakkiliyar, Parayar, 13.7). Limited tank and well irrigation, Groundnut, millets, paddy, other cash crops. Weaving and palmyra tapping important subsidiary occupations. Kongu Goundars dominant landholding caste. Panchayat controlled by Vanniars, Goundars and Sengunthars.

9. Pappanaickenpatti (M.No.22). 12 miles from Attur at foot of Periyakalrayan hills, Attur taluk. Ten hamlets. Not electrified. Population 1787 in 353 HHs. Main communities: Malayalis (ST, 79.7), Gollas (8.1), also Muslims, Telugu Chettiars, Vanniars and Kavara Naidus. Few wells. Predominantly millet cultivation. Malayalis mainly engaged in transport of minor forest produce from the hills to marketing centre in the plains. Telugu Chettiars, Kavara Naidus and Muslims control land. Malayalis in majority in Panchayat.

Coimbatore

10. Nellithorai (M.No.23). Hill village in 11 hamlets at elevations of 1000 to 2000 feet in Nilgiris, 3½ miles to interior from Mettupalayam, Avanashi taluk. Electrified. Population 1005 in 256 HHs. Main communities: Irulars (ST, 57.1) and Okkaligas (26.8). Irrigation from Coonoor river channel and wells. Areca nut topes, paddy and millets. Areca nut topes owned by absentee owners in Coimbatore and Mettupalayam; informal leases with Okkaligas. Panchayat dominated by Okkaligas.

Nilgiris

11. Hallimoyar (M.No.20). Hill village at altitude of 1300 feet, 3 miles to interior on forest pathway from Thengumarahada, Coonoor taluk. Single settlement. Not electrified. Population 191 in 44 HHs. Main communities: Irulars (ST, 69.6), Okkaligas (15.7), Pandithar (8.9), Badagas (5.8). Irrigation from jungle stream. Paddy and kumri cultivation of millets. Land controlled by non-tribals. Badagas dominant in Panchayat.

Thanjavur

12. Kadambangudi (M.No.15). Interior village 3 miles from Solagampatti on Thanjavur-Tiruchirapalli railway line. Thanjavur taluk. Main village and 2 hamlets. Population 717 in 163 HHs. Main communities: Udayar (26.9), Kallar (21.9), Muthurajah (21.9). Padmasilar Chettiars (9.5), Christians (7.0). Grand Anicut canal main irrigation source supplemented by tank. Predominantly paddy (two crops). Some handloom cotton weaving. Udayars main landowning community and dominant in Panchayat.

13. Kunnalur (M.No.11). 1½ miles off Tiruthuraipundi -- Pattukottai road, Tiruthuraipundi taluk. Main village and 2 hamlets. Not electrified. Population 1749 in 402 HHs. Main castes: Pallars (Vaikkarar, 58.4), Thevars (22.1). Irrigated by Cauvery delta. Severe drainage problems. Predominantly paddy (single crop). About two-thirds of cultivated extent under lease from Vedaranyam Devasthanam. Panchayat reflects caste composition by informal agreement.

14. Vilangulam (M.No.25). Coastal village 6 miles from Sethubavachatram, Pattukottai taluk. Main village with one hamlet. Not electrified. Population 1247 in 309 HHs. Main communities:

Pallars (22.9), Christian Pallars (9.7), Thevars (22.1), Kallars (10.8). Irrigated by Grand Anicut canal and tanks. Predominantly paddy (mostly single crop). Due representation for Pallars in Panchayat.

Tiruchirapalli

15. Ariyur (M.No.31). 12½ miles from Karur, Karur taluk. Main village and 3 hamlets. Electrified. Population 1618 in 404 HHs. Main communities: Kongu Goundars (63.7) SC (mainly Chakkiliyar, 21.7). Limited well irrigation. Millets and gingelly main crops. Cotton spinning and weaving subsidiary occupations.

16. Thenbaranadu (m.No.2). Hill village in 16 hamlets located between 700 and 3200 feet in the Pachamalai, 10 miles from Uppliapuram, Musiri taluk. Not electrified. Population 1826 in 397 HHs. Exclusively inhabited by Malayalis (ST). No irrigation except from two small tanks. Predominantly millets.

17. Thiruvellarai (M.No.4). 9 miles from Srirangam off Tiruchirapalli-Thuraiyur road, Lalgudi taluk. Main village and 2 hamlets. Electrified. Population 2184 in 512 HHs. Main communities: Muthurajah (61.8), Sengunthar Mudaliar (5.8), SC (10.6). Limited well and tank irrigation. Millets, groundnut, paddy (single crop) Diamond dressing provides subsidiary occupation. High level of tenancy. Panchayat reflects caste composition by informal understanding.

Madurai

18. Periyur (M.No.24). Hill village at elevation of 4000 feet, 9 miles to interior from Kanalkadu, Kodaikanal taluk. 20 hamlets. Not electrified. Population 2449 in 613 HHs. Main

communities: Telugu Chettiars (44.6), Pulayars (ST, 33.3), Mannadiar (11.1), Coffee, cardamom, plantain and citrus plantations. Mannadis dominate in landownership and Panchayat.

19. Sirumalai (M.No.5). Hill village at altitude of 3500 feet in Sirumalai, Dindigul taluk. 3 hamlets. Not electrified. Population 1920 in 418 HHs. Main communities: Pandya Vellalas (31.4) Balija Naidus (17.5), SC (26.3), Pulayar (ST, 4.2). Coffee, plantain and citrus plantations.

20. Thiruvalavayanallur (M.No.30). 14 miles from Madurai off Madurai-Dindigul highway. Main village with two Harijan colonies. Electrified. Population 542 in 139 HHs. Main communities: Muslims (Rowthers and Pattanis, 30.8), Pandya Vellalas (24.5), SC (33.8). Tank irrigation linked to Periyar system. Predominantly paddy (single crop). Mat-weaving provides some subsidiary occupation. High level of tenancy. Vellalas dominant in Panchayat.

21. Vilpatti (M.No.5). Hill village, 5 miles from Kodaikanal town, Kodaikanal taluk. Main village and 4 hamlets. Electrified. Population 3189. Main communities: Reddiars, Pillais, Mannadiars and Mudaliars. Potato and plantation crops.

Ramanathapuram

22. Athangarai (m.No.12). Coastal village at estuary of Vaigai, 12 miles from Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram taluk. Main village and one hamlet. Not electrified. Population 1721 in 357 HHs. Main communities: Muslims (37.5), Maravar (35.2), Valayar (5.5), Idayar (5.1). No irrigation. Millets. Fishing important subsidiary occupation; controlled by Muslim master fishermen. Muslims and Maravars dominant in Panchayat.

23. Golwarpatti (M.No.26). 8 miles from Sattur, 4½ miles to interior from Sattur-Virudhunagar road, Sattur taluk. 10 hamlets. Electrified. Population 2013 in 501 HHs. Mainly populated Pallars (72.7) and Christian Pallars (15.2). Limited tank irrigation. Millets, paddy, cotton. Panchayat informally chosen by elders with representation to hamlets.

24. Visavanoor (M.No.14). Interior village 15 miles from Ilayankudi, Paramakudi taluk. 8 hamlets. Not electrified. Population 3091 in 649 HHs. Main communities: Christians (41.9), Idayar (22.9), Muslims (8.1), Maravar (6.2). Limited irrigation from rainfed tanks. Millets, paddy, some cash crops. Cooperative society and Panchayat dominated by Maravars.

Tirunelveli

25. Kilakottai (M.No.21). Interior village 3 miles from Tirunelveli-Madurai Road, Kovilpatti taluk. 3 hamlets. Electrified. Population 1398 in 276 HHs. Mainly populated by Pallars (44.9) and Christian Pallars (41.8) belonging to Veeranattar and Devandrakular subdivisions. Limited well irrigation. Millets and cotton. Veeranattars dominate cooperative society and panchayat.

26. Pudukulam (M.No.10). 10 miles from Tirunelveli town off Cape Comorin road, Tirunelveli taluk. 8 hamlets. Not electrified. Population 1609 in 331 HHs. Christians (mainly Nadars, 47.4) Maravar (16.9) Nadar (8.2) SC (11.8). Limited tank irrigation linked to Manimuthar project. Paddy, cotton. Nadars dominant in Panchayat.

27. Ravanasamudram (M.No.7). 10 miles from Ambasamudram off Tenkasi road, Ambasamudram taluk. Single settlement. Electrified. Population 2479 in 573 HHs. Main communities: Muslims (48.5), Saiva Pillais (12.0), Brahmins (10.4). River irrigation from Ramanadhi. Mainly paddy (2 crops). Matweaving and beedi rolling important subsidiary occupations.

Kanyakumari

28. Kadukkara (M.No.13). 10 miles from Nagercoil in Valley surrounded by Vellimalai and Pothigamalai, Thovala taluk. Linear settlement around hillock. Electrified. Population 1769 in 370 HHs. Mainly populated by Nanjilnad Vellala Pillais (80.1). Irrigated by channel linked to Perunchani dam. Paddy and coconuts. Temporary migration for estate labour.

29. Kaduthachery (M.No.16). 5½ miles from Nagercoil, 1½ miles to interior on Manakudi road, Agasteeswaram taluk. Single settlement. Electrified. Population 464 in 130 HHs. Mainly populated by Parayars (Sambavars 45.5) and Christian Sambavars (53.7). Irrigated by tank linked to Vadasery river. Paddy (2 crops). Large extent of absentee landownership and tenancy.

30. Kottuthal Azhamkulam (M.No.19). 6 miles from Kuzhithurai, Vilavancode taluk. Main hamlet on roadside and scattered homesteads in palmyra groves. Not electrified. Population 1406 in 229 HHs. Main communities: Nadars (66.4) Christian Nadars (22.3). Virtually no irrigation. Coconut, tapioca. Palmyra tapping and jaggery manufacture provide subsidiary occupations.

31. Kootumangalam (M.No.8). 2 miles from Kolachel, Kalkulam taluk. Houses located amidst coconut topes. Electrified. Population 703 in 117 HHs. Main communities: Krishnavagayar (53.1) Nadars (25.0). Mainly coconut groves with some paddy. Coir rope making important subsidiary occupation.

****